

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF THE GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

Tuesday, the 26th March 1929.

The House met at 11 o'clock, Mr. President (the hon. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU Garu) in the Chair.

PRESENT:

- Marjoribanks, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., I.C.S., The hon. Sir Norman.
 Usman Sahib Bahadur, Kt., The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad.
 Moir, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. T. E. Krishnan Nayar, The hon. Diwan Bahadur M.
 Subbarayan, The hon. Dr. P.
 Muthiah Mudaliyar, The hon. Mr. S.
 Seturathnam Ayyar, The hon. Mr. M. R.
 Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur.
 Abdul Razack Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur S. K.
 Abdul Wahab Sahib Bahadur, Munshi.
 Adinarayana Chettiyar, Mr. T.
 Anjaneyulu, Mr. P.
 Appavu Chettiyar, Mr. C. D.
 Arogyaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur R. N.
 Appudaswami Udayar, Mr. S.
 Basheer Ahmad Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
 Bhaktavatsulu Nayudu, Mr. P.
 Bhanoji Rao, Mr. A. V.
 Bheemayya, Mr. J.
 Biswanath Das Mahasayo, Sriman.
 Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar, Mr. T. K.
 Cotton, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. C. W. E.
 Dorai Raja, Mr. S. N.
 Ellappa Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur S.
 Ethirajulu Nayudu, Diwan Bahadur P. C.
 Foulkes, Mr. R.
 Gnanavaram Pillai, Mr. P. J.
 Gopala Menon, Mr. C.
 Govindaraja Mudaliyar, Mr. C. S.
 Guruswami, Rao Sahib L. C.
 Harisarvottama Rao, Mr. G.
 Hearson, Mr. H. F. P.
 Hilton Brown, I.C.S., Mr.
 James, Mr. F. E.
 John, Mr. V. Ch.
 Kaleswara Rao, Mr. A.
 Karant, Mr. K. K.
 Kesava Pillai, C.I.E., Diwan Bahadur P.
 Khadir Mohidin Sahib Bahadur, Muhammad.
 Khalif-ul-Jah Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur P.
 Koti Reddi, Mr. K.
 Krishnan, Mr. K.
 Krishnaswami Nayakar, Mr. K. V.
 Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri (Raja Velugoti Sarvagya Kumara Krishnayachendra Bahadur Varu).
 Kumaraswami Reddiyar, Diwan Bahadur S.
 Kuppuswami, Mr. J.
 Mahmud Schammad Sahib Bahadur.
 Mallayya, Dr. B. S.
 Manikkavelu Nayakar, Mr. M. A.
 Marudavanam Pillai, Mr. C.
 Meera Ravuttar Bahadur, K. P. V. S.
 Muhammed.
 Moidoo Sahib Bahadur, Khan Sahib T. M.
 Muniswami Nayudu, Rao Bahadur B.
 Muniswami Pillai, Mr. V. I.
 Muppil Nayar of Kavalappara alias Kumaran Raman, Mr.
 Muthulakshmi Reddi, Dr. (Mrs.).
 Muthuranga Mudaliyar, Mr. C. N.
 Nagan Gowda, Mr. R.
 Nanjappa Bahadur, Subadar-Major S. A.
 Narayana Raju, Mr. D.
 Narayanan Nambudipad, Rao Bahadur O. M.
 Narayanaswami Pillai, Mr. T. M.
 Obi Reddi, Mr. C.
 Parasurama Rao Pantulu, Mr. A.
 Patro, Kt., Rao Bahadur Sir A. F.
 Rajan, Mr. P. T.
 Ramachandra Padayachi, Mr. K.
 Ramachandra Reddi, Mr. B.
 Ramjee Rao, Mr. V.
 Ramaswami Ayyar, Mr. U.
 Rangasatha Mudaliyar, Mr. A.
 Ratnasabapathi Mudaliyar, Rao Bahadur C. S.
 Robertson, Mr. R. J. C.
 Sabajanandam, Swami A. S.
 Saldanha, Mr. J. A.
 Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, Mr.
 Sarabha Reddi, Mr. K.
 Satyamurti, Mr. S.
 Shetty, Mr. A. B.
 Sitarama Reddi, Rao Bahadur K.
 Siva Raj, Mr. N.
 Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar, Mr. K. S.
 Slater, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. S. H.
 Sundarapandia Nadar, Mr. W. P. A.
 Souter, I.C.S., Mr. C. A.
 Srinivasa Ayyangar, Mr. R.
 Srinivasan, Rao Sahib R.
 Swami, Mr. K. V. R.
 Tajudin Sahib Bahadur, Syed.
 Tampoe, I.C.S., Mr. A. McG. C.
 Thomas, Mr. Daniel.
 Uppi Sahib Bahadur, K.
 Venkatapati Raju, Mr. P. C.

{26th March 1929

PRESENT—cont.

Venkataramana Ayyangar, Mr. C. V.
Venkatarangam Nayudu, Mr. C.
Venkiah, Mr. S.
Watson, I.C.S., Mr. H. A.
Wood, Mr. C. E.
Wright, Mr. W. O.

Zamindar of Gollapalli.
Zamindar of Kallikota.
Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
Zamindar of Seithur.
Zamindar of Singampatti.

I

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS

Floods

Widening of the Yeluru bridge at Cocanada.

* 1870 Q.—Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state, with reference to the answer given to question No. 736 (e) on 27th November 1928,—

(a) whether the investigation referred to in clause (b) of the answer has been made and if so, what the result of the same is;

(b) whether it is a fact that one wing of the existing Yeluru bridge collapsed during the floods in October 1928 and that the wing is to be rebuilt at a great cost;

(c) whether the Cocanada Municipal Council in asking for a grant of Rs. 18,500 towards the repair of flood damages included a sum of Rs. 9,000 for rebuilding the collapsed wing wall of the bridge; and

(d) whether the Government propose to direct the addition of a span to the existing bridge and to grant the necessary sum in addition to Rs. 9,000?

A.—(a) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer given to him in reply to clause (a) of question No. 1720, dated 14th March 1929.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes.

(d) The question is under consideration.

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"May I know whether this bridge is in the middle of the city?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"I fear the hon. Member must know more about it than I (Laughter), I am not sure of the exact position."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"Is it not a fact that the public are put to much inconvenience due to the collapse of this bridge?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"I should think so; it is very likely."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"In view of the inconvenience to the public, may I know whether Government will sanction the money required for it without any further delay?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"I am afraid it is hardly within my purview."

26th March 1929]

Forest Panchayats

Agreements by Government with members of the forest panchayats.

* 1871 Q.—Mr. A. PARASURAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the agreements entered into by the Government with the members of the Forest Panchayat were published in the Gazette for general information and if so, when;

(b) whether such agreements contain any provision for the cancellation of the panchayat and if so, under what conditions;

(c) whether it is a fact that without assigning any reason the Board of Revenue is given authority to cancel the agreement;

(d) whether any and if so, what panchayats have been closed;

(e) if so, what were the circumstances under which such drastic action was taken;

(f) whether the panchayat has the liberty of opening the panchayat forest for free grazing provided they regularly pay the amount agreed to be paid to Government;

(g) whether these panchayat members have no liberty of compounding offences committed in respect of such panchayat areas without the intercession of the forest and any other authorities;

(h) whether the Government have any control over the monies that are collected by the panchayat so long as they pay up the amount fixed by Government under the agreement;

(i) whether the fees levied from persons who commit offences in such panchayat areas are credited to Government or to the panchayat;

(j) if they are credited to Government, under what authority;

(k) whether there are two kinds of forest panchayats and, if so, what is the difference between the two; and

(l) whether special kind of panchayats are working in North Arcot district?

A.—(a) The answer is in the negative, but a copy of the standard form of agreement was laid on the table of the House on 27th February 1928 in answer to question No. 1577 asked by the hon. Member.

(b) & (c) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to clause 12 of the form of agreement referred to above.

(d) & (e) The Government have not the information.

(f) The Government can find nothing in the terms of the agreement preventing the panchayats from adopting such a course, provided they comply with the other conditions of the agreement regarding the nature and number of cattle to be admitted, period of closure, etc.

(g) Panchayats, which have been empowered under section 55 of the Madras Forest Act, can compound forest offences. Thirty-one panchayats have been so empowered.

(h) The panchayats are, under the terms of the agreement, bound to maintain cash accounts of receipts and charges. These are inspected by the District Revenue staff.

[26th March 1929]

- (i) To the Government, except in the case of two panchayats, Dalavoipatnam and Eraiyur which have been specially authorized to appropriate the compounding fees.
- (j) Sections 55 and 66 of the Madras Forest Act.
- (k) & (l) The Government are not aware of such a distinction nor of anything special in the constitution of panchayats in the North Arcot district.

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" With reference to clauses (b) and (c), may I know whether the panchayats in carrying out the conditions are to be guided by the rules framed by the Government under chapter 3 of the Forest Act, or by the rules governing reserved forests? "

* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" Notice, Sir."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know, Sir, whether if any portion which was not hitherto in the reserved portion is now included in the panchayat area, the panchayat is free to exercise its jurisdiction under chapter 3 of the Act over that area? "

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" That is asking for an opinion."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" With regard to the cancellation, Sir, the two clauses seem to conflict with each other. 'Failure to comply with any of the conditions above mentioned will be a ground for the cancellation of this agreement.' 'The Board of Revenue reserves the right of such cancellation, without assigning any reason whatsoever.' May I know whether the hon. the Revenue Member will revise them so that the doubt may be cleared? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" The whole question is under consideration."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" What is the statutory basis for these agreements? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" Notice."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know whether the Government have any intention of bringing in a law to regulate the conduct of forest panchayats, and take the vote of the House on that law? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" There is at present no such intention."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know what they are going to do in the matter? What other measures are they going to take? "

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—" If the object cannot be obtained except by legislation then the Government will resort to legislation."

Irrigation

Investigation of the extension of the Kistna East Bank Canal.

* 1872 Q.—Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether any establishment was appointed during 1927-28 and 1928-29 for the investigation of the extension of the Kistna East Bank canal;

26th March 1929]

(b) if so, how much amount has been spent so far for the said investigation ;

(c) whether the investigation is continuing or has been abandoned ;

(d) if it has been abandoned, at what stage it was abandoned, when and why ; and

(e) when it will be taken again ?

A.—(a) Yes. About three and a half months during 1927–28 and four and a half months during 1928–29.

(b) Information as to the exact amount spent is not available with Government.

(c), (d) & (e) Block levels over the whole of the area commanded by the East Bank canal and extension and alignment of channels, etc., and certain other preliminary work had been done up to the middle of August 1928 when the sanction expired.

The question of the extension of the Kistna East Bank canal is part of the scheme for extension of irrigation in the Kistna delta, consequent on the installation of 6 feet shutters over the Kistna anicut, which is to be investigated by a special division to be formed next year.

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ May I know what will be the length of the proposed extension of the canal ? ”

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—“ That depends upon the result of the investigation.”

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ From the result of the investigation so far made, may I know what will be the length of the canal ? ”

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—“ I must ask for notice.”

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ How many acres will be irrigated by the proposed extension ? ”

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—“ That is the very point that is being investigated.”

Issue of water for irrigation to lands under the Kistna ayacut.

* 1873 Q.—Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have decided to give water only for short crop but not for the ordinary crop for about thirty thousands of acres to be included in ayacut under the extension of ayacut scheme in Kistna Eastern delta ; •

(b) whether it is a fact that there will be plenty of water available to be supplied for the ordinary wet crop for all those acres consequent on the heightening of the shutters of the Kistna anicut ;

• (c) whether it is a fact that the short crop is not advantageous to ryots and will not induce many to convert their dry lands into wet ; and

(d) whether the Government intend to reconsider the matter and order the supply of water for the ordinary crops for all the acres to be newly included in the ayacut ?

[26th March 1929]

A.—(a) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to clause (b) of question No. 1375 delivered on 1st February 1929.

(b) No.

(c) The Government are not aware that this is a fact; on the contrary, they have received petitions urging the early execution of the Vempad project which is a 'short crop' scheme for the irrigation of 4,500 acres and the ryots have offered to pay an inclusion fee of Rs. 25 per acre. That seems to indicate that they have no objection to the short crop scheme.

(d) The whole scheme of extension of irrigation in the delta is to be investigated by a special staff proposed to be appointed in April 1929 and the Government do not propose to pass any orders until the Special Officer's report is received.

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" May I know whether the ryots applied to the Government for allowing them to raise a short crop, because even that was better than a dry crop ? "

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" That is asking for an opinion. "

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" Sir, I am asking. . . . "

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Whether the ryots preferred the raising of a short crop or not, is asking for an opinion. "

Expenditure on Original Works—Communications in the Agency.

* 1874 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the amounts spent under the head of " Original Works—Communications " in Agency in each of the years 1920–21 ;

(b) how much of the above was spent in the Agencies of East Godavari, Vizagapatam and Ganjam, respectively ;

(c) whether there is any scheme with regard to this matter and, if so, what that scheme is ; and

(d) the probable cost of the whole scheme ?

A.—(a) The expenditure on " Original Works—Communications " in the Agency are as follows :—

	RS.
1920–21	43,586
1921–22	1,55,575
1922–23	72,170
1923–24	78,289
1924–25	45,779
1925–26	72,599
1926–27	1,74,352
1927–28	2,79,365
1928–29 (revised estimate)	4,85,200

(b) Separate figures for each of the Agencies are not available.

(c) & (d) Yes. A scheme estimated to cost about 27·32 lakhs was approved by the Finance Committee in 1927. The scheme provides for the construction of roads and bridges in order to open up and develop the Agency tracts in Ganjam, Vizagapatam

26th March 1929] .

and East Godavari. The scheme was based on rough preliminary estimates. It is now being revised with reference to regular estimates and the relative importance of the respective works.

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI:—"May I know what Government mean by 'opening and development of Agency tracts'?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—"It means the construction of roads and bridges so that the products there may be transported easily."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI:—"May I know what is the nature of the produce there?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—"Well, timber and any other marketable thing that grows there. You cannot get any machinery to that place without roads and bridges. If you want to start a mining industry there, you cannot take the machinery without these facilities. As it is, the place is not accessible. It is difficult to say what will be the exact nature of the future needs."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI:—"Is not timber the chief product of the Agency tracts?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—"I believe it is at present."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI:—"Is it not a fact that timber is carried from one place to another by floating it down the rivers?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—"There are not rivers everywhere?"

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI:—"May I know whether it is a fact that foreign companies intend to exploit these Agency tracts?"

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—"I am not aware of any such proposal."

Public Service

Alleged collections by Rao Bahadur A. V. Govinda Menon for the Hitchcock Memorial.

* 1875 Q.—Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether Rao Bahadur A. V. Govinda Menon, the present District Judge, North Malabar, assisted by Mr. Amoo Sahib, the then Assistant Superintendent of Police, secured large collections for the Hitchcock Memorial in 1927; and

(b) whether there is a rule that Government servants are not to take part in collecting subscriptions for public or private purposes?

A.—(a) The Government are not aware of any such activity on the part of the officers named. No representation on the subject has reached the Government.

(b) Except with the permission of the Government or of some authority empowered in this behalf by the Government, a Government servant is forbidden to take any part in the collection of money for any public or local purpose.

[26th March 1929]

Depressed classes*Proposed reorganization of the Labour Department.*

* 1876 Q.—Mr. C. GOPALA MENON: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether any proposals for the reorganization of the Labour Department were received from the Commissioner of Labour;

(b) if the answer to (a) is in the affirmative, what these proposals are; and

(c) whether the Government have under consideration any proposal to start special training schools for training teachers employed in the labour schools as community welfare workers or to aid any non-official organization prepared to undertake such training?

A — (a) & (b) Final proposals are awaited.

(c) The answer is in the negative.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—“Sir, in answer to clauses (a) and (b), it is said that ‘final proposals are awaited.’ Have Government received any preliminary proposals?”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
“Yes.”

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—“What are they?”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—“At present I am not in a position to disclose them.”

Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—“As there are very few trained depressed class teachers in labour schools, may I know whether Government will be pleased to afford facilities to get more trained teachers?”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
“The hon. Member will do well to bring the matter to the notice of the Labour Commissioner, who will consider it.”

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI:—“May I know whether most of the schools have teachers who are not trained?”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—
“I am not aware.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“All questions regarding the education of depressed classes should henceforth be put to the hon. the Education Minister.”

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI:—“Sir, the present question is addressed to the hon. the Home Member.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“That means you will have to frame a fresh question addressed to the Education Minister, before you ask any question on that topic.”

Government Press*Dismissal of one Ayyaswami Ayyar, Storekeeper, Government Press.*

* 1877 Q.—Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether one Ayyaswami Ayyar, Storekeeper, Government Press, was dismissed from service with effect from 1st May 1928; if so, why;

26th March 1929].

(b) whether it is a fact that no enquiry was held in his case as contemplated in rule 14 of the Statutory Rules;

(c) whether it is also a fact that the said Ayyaswami Ayyar had been reduced from higher to lower grade with effect from 1st March 1928; if so, why; and

(d) whether it is also a fact that no charge was framed, no explanation called for, no enquiry held or that not even a warning was given before the reduction was ordered?

A.—(a) Yes. He was dismissed for insubordination.

(b) An enquiry was held.

(c) Yes; because he failed to give the security required from a holder of the higher post.

(d) No. He was ordered on 24th December 1927 to furnish the security and warned on 1st February 1928. As the transfer was not a punishment a charge and enquiry were unnecessary.

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—"What is the act of insubordination that this man is guilty of?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—

"While he was on leave on medical certificate he took an active part in convening a meeting of the employees of the Government Press and when he was asked to explain his conduct he convened another meeting. His service records show that he has always been insubordinate."

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—"Is the hon. the Home Member aware that anything that a man does while on leave cannot amount to insubordination? When I am on leave and if I do an act then, it cannot constitute an act of insubordination?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"That is asking for an opinion."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—"May I know whether there is a rule that characterises attending meetings as acts of insubordination?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—

"It is not a question of attending a meeting; when he was asked for an explanation instead of giving an explanation he convened another meeting."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—"May I know which act amounts to insubordination?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—

"Both together."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—"Sir, you said he was insubordinate because he convened another meeting, when asked for an explanation; and now you say 'both together'."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—

"I said the whole act amounts to insubordination. While on leave on medical certificate he took an active part in convening a meeting and when asked for an explanation he summoned another meeting and took part in it."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—"May I know what the hon. the Home Member means by 'active part'?"

[26th March 1929]

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—
“Convening a meeting and taking part in it.”

Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI :—“May I know who conducted the inquiry?”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—
“The inquiry was held by the Superintendent of the Government Press.”

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—“May I know whether the hon. the Home Member is aware of the fact that the notice for convening the second meeting had already been issued when he received the order of explanation?”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—“I am not aware.”

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—“Has the hon. the Home Member inquired into the whole matter?”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—
“I have inquired into the matter already.”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“Are the Government aware that when he addressed the second meeting he had not received the communication from the Superintendent?”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“It has been answered.”

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“With regard to the giving of security is it not a fact that it was not demanded till two years had elapsed?”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—
“Yes.”

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“Why was it done when his pay had already been reduced?”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—
“Because new rules came into force.”

Police

Rent-free quarters to officers of the Police department.

* 1878 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) the number of officers of various grades in the Police department who are provided with buildings;

(b) whether any rent is charged for any of them;

(c) whether those who are not given official quarters are given any house-rent allowance; and

(d) if so, how much?

A.—(a) The following classes of officers and men of the Police department are entitled to rent-free quarters :—

- (1) Sub-Inspectors, Sergeants, Probationary Sub-Inspectors, head constables and constables,
- (2) Special Police, Malabar,
- (3) All members of the Madras City Police,

26th March 1929]

- (4) Special branch clerks, Criminal Investigation Department,
- (5) Inspectors of Police, Criminal Investigation Department, stationed in Madras, and
- (6) Deputy Superintendent, Railways and Criminal Investigation Department.

Houses are rented for those who are not provided with Government quarters.

The number of police officers below the rank of Inspector for whom quarters existed at the end of 1927 was 96 Sergeants, 439 Sub-Inspectors, 1,950 head constables and 14,538 constables. There is no information about the number of quarters since constructed and the number of houses rented for those who are not provided with Government quarters.

Information is also not available regarding the number of houses built, taken on lease or bought for police officers of and above the rank of Inspectors.

- (b) In the case of officers not entitled to rent-free quarters but provided with residences the standard rent or 10 per cent of the salary, whichever is less, is recovered.
- (c) & (a) Head constables and constables in the City Police who are not provided with Government quarters are granted a house-rent allowance of Rs. 7 and Rs. 5 respectively, subject to approval of residence. For other ranks in the City and for those in the mufassal entitled to rent-free quarters houses are rented for them if Government quarters are not available.

Arrest of Mr. Sambamurti under section 108, Criminal Procedure Code.

* 1879 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether proceedings were taken against Sjt. Bulusu Sambamurti under section 108, Criminal Procedure Code, regarding certain speeches said to have been made by him since June 1928;

(b) whether any legal opinion was obtained with a view to ascertain whether these speeches or any portions of them fell under section 124-A, Indian Penal Code; and

(c) if so, when that was done—either before or after the arrest?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) & (c) The Government are not aware whether the police obtained legal opinion or not.

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI:—“May I know whether the hon. the Home Member had any information before, that this Bulusu Sambamurti was delivering lectures that are objectionable?”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—

“That was the subject matter of inquiry by the District Magistrate.”

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI:—“Previous to that inquiry did the hon. the Home Member receive any information that Mr. Sambamurti was delivering seditious speeches?”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—

“Notice.”

[26th March 1929]

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" Did Government send any of his speeches to the hon. the Advocate-General to see whether they can be said to be seditious under the Act ? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—
" No, Sir. "

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know whether the hon. the Home Member looked into the records of the case ? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—
" The records have been received by the Government and are being looked into "

Proceedings against Mr. Sambamurti.

* 1880 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the proceedings against Sjt. Bulusu Sambamurti were started by this Government on their own behalf or as agents of some other Government; and

(b) if the latter, what the other Government is ?

A.—(a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" The answer to clause (a) is 'No'. Am I to understand that this answer refers to both parts of the clause ? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—
" Yes. "

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" Is the sending of the speeches of Mr Sambamurti—does that also come under the portfolio of the hon. the Home Member ? Otherwise how can he know that the speeches were not sent to the Advocate-General ? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—
" I know the speeches were not sent. "

Mr. P. C. VENKATAPATI RAJU :—" If the reply is that no Government authorized the proceedings, then on whose instructions were the proceedings taken ? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—
" The proceedings were taken by the police. "

Mr. P. C. VENKATAPATI RAJU :—" Without any instructions from any higher authority ? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—
" Yes. "

Treatment of Mr. Sambamurti while undergoing trial.

* 1881 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether the District Magistrate was given any special directions with regard to the treatment of Sambamurti while undergoing trial ?

A.—No.

26th March 1929]

Proceedings against Mr. Sambamurti.

* 1882 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

11-15
a.m.

(a) whether Government have received reports that speeches of the kind for which proceedings were taken against Sjt. Bulusu Sambamurti are made all over the country by responsible leaders of the people; and

(b) why in this particular case alone proceedings were launched?

A.—(a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTA MA RAO:—"May I know in view of the fact, the records are being examined, whether the question is being considered as to the propriety of launching proceedings in this case by the police without reference to the Government?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"Yes, Sir."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO:—"May I know whether any correspondence has gone on between the Government of India and this Government with regard to any repressive policy to be followed by this Government?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"No, Sir."

Alleged threatening of Mr. Sesha Chariyar of Walajapet for feeding Congress workers.

* 1883 Q.—Mr. C. VENKATARANGAM NAYUDU: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that Kasim Ali, Police constable No. 274 of Ranipet, threatened Mr. Sesha Chariyar of Walajapet for having given food to Mr. K. R. Jamathagni Nayakar, a Congress worker, with a criminal prosecution if he entertained Congress workers;

(b) whether the Government propose to take any action in the matter; and

(c) if not, why not?

A.—The Government have no information but have called for it.

Alleged threatening of bus owners by the Sub-Inspector of Police, Peranamallore.

* 1884 Q.—Mr. C. VENKATARANGAM NAYUDU: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that Mr. Bagavan Singh, Sub-Inspector of Police, Peranamallore, Wandiwash taluk, is threatening bus owners saying that their licences will be cancelled if they give room to Mr. K. V. Srinivasa Bharathi in their buses;

(b) whether the Government propose to make any enquiry in the matter; and

(c) if not, why not?

A.—The Government have no information but have called for it.

[26th March 1929]

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" May I know, Sir, when the information is expected to come? Can it be expected before the close of this meeting? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—" I cannot say, Sir, when it will come."

Railways

Re-opening of the Trikanad Railway station.

* 1885 Q.—Mr. MAHMUD SCHAMNAD : Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state with reference to the answers to the questions No. 1624, dated 2nd March 1929 and No. 1364, dated 1st February 1929, regarding the re-opening of the Trikanad Railway station—

(a) what the distance is between Trikanad station and the newly opened station called Kotikulam; and

(b) what the daily average income was at Kotikulam and Trikanad stations before the closing of the Trikanad station?

A.—(a) About 6 furlongs.

(b) The Government have no information.

Civil Justice

Work done by the District Judge, North Malabar, and the Sub-Judge, Tellicherry, between 7th and 10th February 1929.

* 1886 Q.—Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether Rao Bahadur A. V. Govinda Menon, the present District Judge, North Malabar, and the Subordinate Judge, Tellicherry, took casual leave on 13th February 1929 in order to attend the 'party' or entertainment given to the hon. the Law Member at Calicut on that date; and

(b) what is the output of the work of the District Judge, North Malabar, and of the Sub-Judge, Tellicherry, between 7th and 10th February 1929, both days inclusive?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The Government have no information.

Delay in the disposal of cases in courts.

* 1887 Q.—Mr. MAHMUD SCHAMNAD : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have taken or propose to take any action at all regarding the delay in the disposal of cases in courts; and

(b) if so, what the action they propose to take is?

A.—(a) & (b) If the hon. Member will mention specific instances of delay, the Government will bring them to the notice of the High Court.

26th March 1929]

Transfer of sub-judges and district munsifs.

* 1888 Q.—Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any rule or convention according to which munsifs, sub-judges and district judges may serve in any one place only for a certain number of years; and

(b) if not, whether the Government propose to move in that direction?

A.—(a) The power of appointment and transfer of district munsifs is vested in the High Court under section 7 of the Madras Civil Courts Act.

There is no rule or convention as suggested in the question in the case of sub-judges and district judges.

(b) No

Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI:—“With reference to the answer to clause (a), may I know whether there is any such convention in other sister departments, at present that they should not be detained in one place for more than three years ordinarily?”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“I do not know, Sir.”

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—“The question was with reference to munsifs, sub-judges and district judges, but the answer is given only with reference to sub-judges and district judges. May I know what the answer is with regard to munsifs?”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“It is there in clause (a). If he had read it carefully he would have seen it. My Friend did not read it, i.e., that the power is vested in the High Court.”

Mr. K. R. KARANT:—“May I know, Sir, whether it is the policy of the Government in the case of sub-judges and district judges that they should continue in any one place as long as those officers please?”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“There is no hard and fast rule, Sir.”

Forests

Establishment and work of the Forest department.

* 1889 Q.—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased—

(i) to place before the House a statement showing—

(a) the latest sections into which the Forest department has been divided for conservation, regeneration, exploitation and other purposes;

(b) the several officers in each section with a pay of Rs. 1,000 and more;

(c) the number of other officers and subordinates in the several grades; and

(d) the total cost of the establishment in each section; and

(ii) to state—

(a) whether Government propose to increase or reduce the staff in each section;

[26th March 1929]

(b) whether there has been laid down any programme of work for each section for a number of years (say five) in advance; and

(c) what this programme is with estimated receipts, expenditure and profits?

A.—(i) (a) to (d) This department has not been divided into sections in the manner indicated in the question. In the budget, provision for the officers and establishments has been made under the following heads:—

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| 8. a. General Direction ... | (Chief Conservator's office.) |
| 8. c. i. District establishments. | (General Forest Administration excluding Working Plan Circle.) |
| 8. c. ii. Research ... | (Research Officer and his establishments.) |
| 8. c. iii. Exploitation ... | (Chief Forest Engineer, his office and the other offices subordinate to him.) |
| 8. c. iv. Forest College ... | (College and its staff.) |
| 8. c. v. Chenchu Officer ... | (Chenchu Officer and his establishments.) |
| 52-A. c. ii. Regeneration. | (Working Plans Circle and establishment charges pertaining to the regeneration units of Nilambur and Mount Stuart.) |

The Civil Budget Estimate for 1929-30 (I Edition) contains information as to the number of officers and subordinates employed under each of the sub-heads and their estimated cost. The Chief Conservator, all the Conservators, the Chief Forest Engineer, the Logging Engineer and the Forest Engineer (Major W. F. Chipp) draw more than Rs. 1,000; some of the Indian Forest Service officers may also draw Rs. 1,000 and above as their scale of pay is on a progressive scale of Rs. 325—1,350 *plus* overseas pay. This number is likely to vary with time. Provision has been made in the budget for 1929-30 for each officer for the pay that he would draw on 1st April 1929.

(ii) (a) The question of the revision of the strength of the Indian Forest Service and Madras Forest Service and the strength of foresters and guards is under consideration. The appointment of the Chief Forest Engineer and Logging Engineer will terminate on 31st May 1930 and 21st October 1929 respectively.

(b) & (c) There is no programme laid down for a number of years in advance. The estimates of anticipated revenue and expenditure are being prepared for one year ahead. The figures are available for 1929-30 alone.

26th March 1929] *

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" With reference to clauses (b) and (c), may I know, Sir, why no programme is laid for some years for every section? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Because it has not been considered necessary."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Is the hon. the Law Member sure that no programme is laid down for five years in regard to working plans? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" No programme for five years has been laid down."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" For some sections it may be two years, for some it may be only one year. Similarly, are there no working plans for some years? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Of course, working plans are intended certainly for more than one year."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Are Government aware what working plans they have got in view now? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Notice, Sir."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know, Sir, what the period generally is for which a working plan is drawn up? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Notice, Sir "

Honorary Magistrates

Committee for the selection of Honorary Presidency Magistrates.

* 1890 Q.—Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state whether there is a committee for selecting Honorary Presidency Magistrates in Madras and who are the members of the committee?

A.—Yes. The committee consists of the Collector of Madras (President), the Chief Presidency Magistrate and the Commissioner of Police.

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" May I know from the hon. the Law Member whether the Commissioner of Police was present on this Board when Mr. Paisley was selected for an Honorary Magistrate's place—the same man who recommended his removal now? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" No, Sir."

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" Was he recommended by the then Law Member of the Government to be made an Honorary Presidency Magistrate? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" There was no case of any recommendation by the Law Member. The Law Member had an important part in appointing him."

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" Did they do their duty all right, Sir, when they appointed him? Mr. Paisley was selected by them, to hold office as Honorary Magistrate for three years. And at the end of that period, the Commissioner of Police who is a new man says that there is an old standing complaint against this man and . . ."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member is giving information to the Government."

[26th March 1929]

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" I should like to know, Sir, whether the Board did their duty all right in appointing this man? "

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" That is asking for an opinion."

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—" May I know whether the Government enquired whether the committee which selected was aware of the fact of this externment? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" So far as the records before the Government are concerned, they were not aware."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know, Sir, whether the Government have been influenced by the fact that the man was externed from His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Dominions or whether they have examined the reasons for that externment before they passed this order? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Only the former fact "

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" May I know whether Mr. Paisley is a British subject or a subject of His Exalted Highness the Nizam? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" My hon. Friend Mr. Saldanha told me that he was a native of Mangalore."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" I do not think? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I believe it was my Friend Mr. Saldanha who told me that."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know, Sir, whether the Government intend to follow this as a general policy that anybody externed from any Native State should be debarred from honorary appointments? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" That will be considered, Sir, when the question of policy arises. This is the only instance that has arisen so far."

Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI :—" May I know on what grounds the externment was made? Was it for criticising the Nizam's Government or for any other reasons? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I do not know."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" Do the Government make an enquiry and write to a foreign Government asking them for the reasons for their action? "

Mr. DANIEL THOMAS :—" May I know if his work as honorary magistrate was satisfactory and whether he discharged the duties of his office well? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" The Government have no information either way."

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—" May I know, Sir, why, if he is a British subject, the Government are inflicting this disability on him without going into the question of reasons for his externment? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" It will be discourtesy to a foreign Government to ask them why they took a particular political action."

26th March 1929]

Mr. K. R. KARANT:—"Is it not discourtesy to a British subject to withdraw his powers without assigning any reasons?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"That is a matter of opinion, Sir."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI:—"May I know from the hon. Member whether he is acting solely on the action of His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Government in regard to this matter?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Yes. That is the answer already given."

Alleged withdrawal of the powers of Mr. Paisley as Presidency Magistrate.

* 1891 Q.—Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the powers of Mr. C. P. Paisley as Honorary Presidency Magistrate were withdrawn recently on a report by the Commissioner of Police, Madras; and if so, whether he will be pleased to place the report on the table;

(b) whether there were any complaints from any quarter about the way in which Mr. Paisley discharged his duties as Honorary Presidency Magistrate since his appointment and up to the date of the withdrawal of his powers;

(c) if the answer is in the affirmative, what is the number and nature of the complaints received and from whom they were received;

(d) whether any investigation was made to find out the truth of these complaints and by whom the investigation was made;

(e) whether any and if so, which of the complaints were found to be true;

(f) whether Mr. Paisley was informed of these complaints and whether he was given an opportunity to offer his remarks or explanation thereon; if not, why this was not done;

(g) whether the Commissioner of Police was moved to take this action by the private complaint of a one Mr. E. A. Lobo, Bar-at-Law, in Madras relating to a private matter and if so, whether it was known or ascertained that such a complaint resulted from a disagreement or private quarrel;

(h) what was the nature of the complaint on which the Commissioner of Police made a report and why the complainant was not referred to a court of law to seek redress?

A.—(a) to (f) In December last, the Commissioner of Police brought to the notice of the Government the fact that Mr. Paisley had been externed from His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Dominions. The Government thought it undesirable to continue such a person as an Honorary Presidency Magistrate and directed the Chief Presidency Magistrate to give Mr. Paisley an opportunity of resigning his appointment, telling him that the Government were not prepared to permit an externed person to continue as an Honorary Presidency Magistrate. Mr. Paisley, however, did not choose to tender his resignation and the Government withdrew his powers. The Government regret their inability to place the report of the Commissioner of Police on the table of the House.

(g) & (h) The Government have no information.

[26th March 1929]

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ May I know whether the Government does not think it is its duty to protect the rights of its subjects when unjustly interfered with by a neighbouring Native State ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ When the question arises, the Government will consider it.”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ The question has arisen now, Sir.”

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“ May I know whether the Government will enquire as to what offence Mr. Paisley committed in His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Dominions to deserve externment, and examine the question of debarring of this gentleman from that point of view ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ That is exactly what I said on more than one occasion, namely, that it would be discourteous to a foreign Government to ask them to give the reasons for their action.”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ May I know, Sir, whether discourtesy is greater than depriving the rights of a British subject, and whether they believe . . . ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ That is arguing.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ May I ask, Sir, if it is the policy of the Government that no one should be appointed as an honorary magistrate who is externed from an Indian State ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ The question of policy has not arisen.”

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—“ May I ask, Sir, whether the Government will be pleased to call for the information in clauses (g) and (h) as to whether after all it is not a private complaint which has led to all this ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ I do not think it is necessary, Sir.”

Reasons for the withdrawal of Mr. Paisley's powers.

* 1892 Q.—Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state whether the reasons for the withdrawal of the power of Mr. Paisley as an Honorary Magistrate were based on circumstances antecedent or subsequent to the appointment as Honorary Presidency Magistrate ; and whether they were known to the Select Committee for Honorary Magistrates or to the Government before his appointment as Honorary Magistrate ?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer given to question No. 1891. The fact that Mr. Paisley had been externed from His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Dominions was not known to the Government when he was appointed Honorary Presidency Magistrate.

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ Are the Government aware that Mr. Paisley criticised His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Government from Madras in 1921, and for that criticism the Government passed a serious order externing those who criticised them ? And is it a crime sufficiently serious to

26th March 1929]

deprive this man selected by a committee consisting of responsible officers of this Government to hold that office for three years, and now to say that he was externed and owing to that circumstance”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“The hon. Member instead of putting a supplementary question is making a speech. The hon. Member will kindly resume his seat and carefully shape his supplementary question.”

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—“May I know, Sir, from the hon. the Law Member whether he has enquired into the fact whether Mr. Paisley ever lived in the Nizam’s Dominions, and if he did, how long?”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“No, Sir.”

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO:—“May I know what externment from a Native State has to do with debarring him from being an honorary magistrate?”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“Because the Government thought that a person of that political complexion should not be an honorary magistrate.”

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—“May I know if the Nizam’s Government have written to this Government about this gentleman?”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“No, Sir.”

Mr. K. KOTI REDDI:—“May I know what it is that prompted this Government having waited for three years after allowing him to work as an honorary magistrate to deprive him of his powers?”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“It is only now that this fact has come to the notice of this Government.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—“May I know, Sir, what is the political complexion that will satisfy my hon. Friend before he thinks he can appoint persons to Honorary Magistrates places? Are they to be loyal to the 300 and odd of potentates in these Indian States?”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“I refuse to answer such a question.”

Externment of Mr. Paisley by His Exalted Highness the Nizam.

* 1893 Q.—Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state whether the externment of Mr. Paisley by His Exalted Highness the Nizam passed more than seven years ago was utilized as an ostensible justification for the withdrawal of the powers conferred on Mr. Paisley?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer given to question No. 1891.

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA:—“Will the Government take steps to see that this withdrawal is restored again, to do justice to a British-born subject?”

• The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“No, Sir.”

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA:—“Is it not a fact that there were certain persons who have been exiled or externed from the Nizam’s Dominions and yet they have been appointed to the highest posts and given titles by the British Government?”

[26th March 1929]

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I do not know, Sir."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know whether the externment from the Nizam's Dominions in this case is without limit of time or is it limited to any particular period of time? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I do not know, Sir."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" May I know what political complexion is involved in the externment? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" The Government of His Exalted Highness the Nizam thought that this gentleman was not a fit person to be a subject of that State."

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—" May I know whether this Government have seen any order of the Nizam's Government and whether there has been any representation from the Nizam's Government in this matter? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I already answered that question, Sir."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know whether the Government debar this gentleman from being an honorary magistrate for life if the externment is for life? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" The question of his incapacity for life has not arisen."

References to Executive Council Members, etc., by Mr. Paisley.

* 1894 Q.—Dr. B.S. MALLAYYA: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether Mr. Paisley gave excellent references and whether these references included (1) a Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, (2) an ex-Member of the Madras Executive Council, (3) an ex-Minister of the Madras Cabinet, (4) an ex-President of the Madras Legislative Council and (5) a present Judge of the High Court;

(b) whether Government made any reference to any of these gentlemen and, if so, with what result; and

(c) if not, why not.

A.—(a) to (c) In a petition submitted to the Government Mr. Paisley suggested references to some of the gentlemen indicated in the question. The Government did not consider it necessary to make any reference to them.

Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI :—" It is stated in the answer that Mr. Paisley suggested references to some gentlemen as mentioned in the question. May I know whether the gentlemen to whom reference was made spoke well of this particular gentlemen, Mr. Paisley? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" He simply suggested references to some of these gentlemen, but no reference was made by the Government to those gentlemen."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" May I know whether the Government would make a reference to these gentlemen now that they have come to know of this question of externment? "

26th March 1929] *

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" There is no need, because the order of the Government is based upon the fact of externment and that is a circumstance which is admitted by Mr. Paisley himself."

Alleged representation against the withdrawal of Mr. Paisley's powers.

* 1895 Q.—Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether any representation was received from the Honorary Presidency Magistrates' Association objecting on principle to the withdrawal of Mr. Paisley's powers; and

(b) if so, what was the reply given by Government to the Association?

A.—(a) The answer is in the affirmative.

(b) The Government did not consider it necessary to issue a reply.

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" Are the Government to be guided, Sir, by the externment orders passed by His Exalted Highness the Nizam or by whomsoever it might have been or by their own officers or committee in appointing a person as honorary magistrate? Are they going to respect the opinions of their own officers doing honorary service or the opinion of a neighbouring potentate who happens to be now in favour with the local Government?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question does not arise."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" May I know if there are any qualifications that are mentioned in the rules which enable Government to appoint honorary magistrates, and if one of the rules is to the effect that anybody externed from a neighbouring State is also disqualified?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The supplementary question has no bearing on the answer given here."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know from the Law Member whether this Government has entered into an agreement with the Nizam's Government that any person externed from their state . . . ?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" How does it arise out of this question which relates to a representation from the Honorary Presidency Magistrates' Association?"

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" May I know whether there is one set of rules for honorary magistrates and another set of rules for the Presidency Magistrates?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question does not arise."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" May I know with reference to (b) why the Government did not consider it necessary to issue a reply?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" In the Government's opinion it was not necessary."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" May I know why that representation was not consulted by the Government?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Because the Government thought that it was not necessary."

e[26th March 1929

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ May I know whether the Government ascertained beforehand whether the externment was based on political grounds or personal grounds ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ No, Sir.”

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—“ May I enquire whether the Government thought it fit to respect the opinion of the Commissioner of Police rather than the opinion of the association of honorary magistrates ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ The Government attach more weight to the fact of externment than the opinion of this association.”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ May I know whether the Government are going to respect the opinions of the Commissioner of Police or of the High Court of Madras ? ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The question does not arise.”

Alleged ill-treatment of Mr. Bulusu Sambamurti.

* 1895-A Q.—Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that Mr. Bulusu Sambamurti was made to walk from the Central Jail to the Rajahmundry railway station when he was transferred from Rajahmundry jail to Bellary jail;

(b) whether it is a fact that he was also made to carry his clothing, bedding and other articles;

(c) what is the distance from the Central jail to the railway station; and why no conveyance was supplied for him and his articles to the railway station;

(d) what action the Government intend to take against the prison officials who treated Mr. Sambamurti like that; and

(e) what action the Government intend to take with regard to better treatment of political prisoners, in conformity with the opinion of the council as expressed in the cut motion on the subject carried by the council on 19th March 1929?

A.—(a) to (d) The Government have no information but they have called for a report.

(e) The matter is under the consideration of Government.

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ May I know whether it was at midnight that Mr. Sambamurti was made to walk from the Central jail to the railway station ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ That is exactly what I have stated; I have called for information.”

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ When was the information called for and when is it expected to come to Government ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ Immediately after the receipt of the question and the information will come in the usual course.”

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—“ May I know whether similar treatment as set out here has been meted out to any other political prisoner of the status and reputation of Mr. Sambamurti ? ”

26th March 1929].

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I do not know anything either way."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" With reference to (e), may I know when the Government will pass final orders with regard to the better treatment of political prisoners? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" After the receipt of the report called for."

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" How long will it take? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" I hope to get it in a reasonable time. I cannot specify the number of days."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Did they call for a report by telegram or by letter? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" By letter."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Could they not call for it by telegram? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" A letter was sent."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" May I know whether the Government do not read newspapers at all? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Government generally are not prepared to take action on newspaper reports."

Mr. P. BHAKTAVATSULU NAYUDU :—" In answer to clauses (a) to (d), the Government say that they have no information. In the answer to clause (e) it is stated the matter is under consideration. When they have no information what is it that is under consideration? "

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is not admissible."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya :—" May I know whether this consideration regarding the treatment of political prisoners will be effected very shortly, so that political prisoners now undergoing their term may get the benefit of it? "

*The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Yes, Sir ; I shall dispose of the question soon."

State Prisoners

Release of Chettali Beeyumma.

* 1896 Q.—Mr. MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any petition from Chettali Beeyumma recently through the Collector of South Kanara ;

(b) if so, whether she has asked in her petition the increase of her allowance in case the Government is satisfied after her examination by a doctor that she cannot remain alone without the help of a servant ;

(c) whether she agrees in the petition to give any undertaking required by Government if she is to be released ; and

(d) what action Government propose to take on the petition?

A.—(a) Yes, one dated 6th December 1928.

(b) She did not ask for an increase of allowance,

[26th March 1929]

(c) She makes no such offer to give any undertaking.

(d) The Government have refused her permission to return to Malabar.

11-30
a.m.

Mr. MAHMUD SCHAMNAD SAHIB :—“ May I know whether the Government propose to release the old lady if she is willing to give any undertaking required ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ I shall consider the suggestion if she offers an undertaking.”

Mr. K. UPPI SAHIB :—“ May I know whether the Government will make any provision for an attendant to help her ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ Government give her money.”

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“ May I know whether the Government are afraid of the old woman ? ”

The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ No.”

Education

Alleged communal distinction in the Sanskrit College, Tirupati.

* 1897 Q.—Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Sanskrit College, Tirupati, gets a grant from the Government annually;

(b) whether it is a fact that in that college ‘ Vyakaranam ’ is not taught to non-Brahmans;

(c) if the answer to clause (b) be in the positive, why a distinction is so made; and

(d) what action the Government propose to take to remedy the grievance?

A.—(a) No.

(b) to (d) A report has been called for.

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“ May I know, with reference to (a), whether the Sanskrit College is not in receipt of any kind of aid from Government for any purpose ? ”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“ Not so far as I am aware of.”

Reduction of the Government grant to Gudivada Taluk Board.

* 1898 Q.—Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Director of Public Instruction has sent orders recently to the President, Gudivada Taluk Board, cutting short the Government grant and asking the latter to reduce the number of elementary schools existing in the Board;

(b) whether the Government will place the said orders on the table of the House;

26th March 1929]

(c) whether by these orders the Gudivada Taluk Board is obliged to close thirty elementary schools now; and

(d) whether the Government propose to give sufficient grants to the Board to maintain all the existing elementary schools at least?

A.—(a) & (b) The subsidy due to the taluk board for elementary education has not been reduced.

(c) & (d) The Taluk Board, Gudivada, has, on its own responsibility, opened a number of elementary schools in recent years, when there was not sufficient recurring surplus in the Elementary Education Fund to provide for their maintenance, resulting in a large deficit in that fund. Of these schools, six are girls' schools opened in centres with a population of 2,000 and above and the question of sanctioning a subsidy in respect of them is under consideration in connexion with the budget estimate for 1929-30. The Government have not been able to sanction any special subsidy in respect of the other schools, and have asked the taluk board to avoid the deficit in the Elementary Education Fund by curtailing expenditure.

Appointment of Andhras to colleges in Andhra districts.

* 1899 Q.—Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state whether the Syndicate of the Andhra University passed a resolution that whenever possible Andhras alone ought to be appointed to all posts in the colleges of the Andhra districts and communicated the same to Government?

A.—The Government received a letter from the Registrar, Andhra University, written under the directions of the Syndicate, stating that it was essential that the staff in Government colleges in the Andhra University area should remain an Andhra staff using the word 'Andhra' in a geographical sense and requesting that transfers of members of the staff in those colleges might not be made to places outside the University area.

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI:—"May I know whether the Government propose to comply with the request of the Syndicate?"

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"The department of education is one. The exigencies of the department and its activities have to be taken into consideration before coming to a conclusion."

Appointment of Andhras in the office of the Director of Public Instruction.

* 1900 Q.—Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) the number of posts in the office of the Director of Public Instruction carrying salaries of Rs. 100 and upwards;

(b) how many of them are held at present by Andhras; and

(c) the reasons for the inadequate representation of the Andhras if any in the matter of the said posts?

A.—(a) Thirty.

(b) & (c) The Government will call for the information.

[26th March 1929]

Nature of instruction given in the Training College, Rajahmundry.

* 1901 Q.—Mr. C. RAMASOMAYAJULU : Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether at the time of the re-establishment of the Training College at Rajahmundry the Government undertook to institute and work the same on the same lines as the Teachers' College, Saidapet ;

(b) whether in the matter of departments of instruction the said policy has been worked out ; and

(c) whether the branches of instruction in Geography, Natural Science, Kindergarten have been opened in the Rajahmundry Training College, and if not, why not ?

A.—(a) The idea was that the Training College, Rajahmundry, should be run almost on the same lines as the Teachers' College at Saidapet.

(b) The Teachers' College, Saidapet, provides for special lectures in a larger number of subjects than the Training College at Rajahmundry.

(c) There is no provision at present for special lectures in the three subjects referred to in the Training College, Rajahmundry. It is proposed to provide for such lectures in Geography in the College from the next academic year. The question of providing for the other subjects will be examined.

Proposed reduction of grants for the purchase of scientific instruments.

* 1902 Q.—Rao Babadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATHI MUDALIYAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have under contemplation the reduction of grants for the purchase of scientific appliances from two-thirds to half and how they propose to utilize the savings thus effected ;

(b) whether the Director of Public Instruction has called for opinions on the matter from the Headmasters of schools ;

(c) if so, what replies have been received ;

(d) whether it is a fact that educational guilds and organizations have been urging on the Government for enhancement of the grant ; and

(e) whether the Government propose to finally and fully revise the Grant-in-aid Code or whether they propose to revise it piecemeal ?

A.—(a) The matter is under the consideration of Government.

(b) & (c) Managements of a few aided institutions were consulted on the matter. Some of these have replied. They are generally against the proposal.

(d) Certain teachers' guilds have also made representations to Government on this matter.

(e) The general question of revising the system of grants to secondary schools is under consideration.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"May I know whether the Government will be pleased not to pass any order till the general revision of the Grant-in-aid is taken up ?"

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"No action will be taken in the meantime."

26th March 1929]

Libraries in Government Colleges.

* 1903 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

- (a) the book value of libraries in Government colleges;
- (b) the grants made to each during the last five years;
- (c) whether the Government have any policy regarding the aid given to these libraries; and
- (d) if so, what that policy is?

A.—(a) The information is not available.

(b), (c) & (d) The allotment made for the purchase of books for Government colleges during the last five years is given below:—

	1924-25.	1925-26.	1926-27.	1927-28.	1928-29 (Revised Estimate).
	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
The College of Engineering ..	379	996	1,273	2,000	2,000
The Law College ..	3,977	2,918	2,852	3,000	3,000
Teachers' Colleges, Saidapet and Rajahmundry ..	952	1,635	1,489	2,063	2,700
The Lady Willingdon Training College ..	1,176	1,392	1,247	1,390	1,700
The Queen Mary's College for Women, Madras.	2,005	1,253	2,000	2,459	3,000
Government Arts Colleges for Men (nine in number) *	17,496	21,288	22,254	22,349	28,000

The annual allotment for each college is fixed with reference to its needs.

* Separate figures for each training college and arts college are not available.

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI:—“Will the hon. the Minister call for information with regard to (a)?”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—“It is rather an elaborate process and I do not think any useful purpose will be served by calling for such information.”

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI:—“With reference to (b), (c) and (d), may I know whether any grant is set apart for libraries?”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—“It is for the purchase of books.”

Selection of students for training in training schools.

* 1904 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) how many of the students admitted in 1927-28 in the training schools in the Presidency had been employed previously as teachers; and

(b) whether the Government have any scheme or policy with regard to the selection of students for training in the training schools?

[26th March 1929]

A.—(a) The information is not available.

(b) The selection of candidates for training in training schools is regulated by the rules in Chapters IX and X of the Madras Educational Rules.

Teaching grants to European secondary schools.

* 1905 Q.—MR. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) the number of European secondary schools to whom teaching grants are made at present;

(b) what proportion the grant makes to the amount actually spent by those schools; and

(c) the number of students benefited by these grants?

A.—(a) 58.

(b) 22 per cent.

(c) 8,170.

Reorganization of the Educational Service.

* 1906 Q.—MR. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state whether orders are going to be passed in the near future reorganizing certain branches of the Subordinate Educational Service; and if so, what they are?

A.—Yes. A copy of the orders will be placed on the table of the House as soon as they are issued.

Revision of the Grant-in-Aid Code.

* 1907 Q.—MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is a proposal before the Government for revising the Grant-in-Aid Code and if so, how long it has been under consideration and at what stage it is at present;

(b) whether the Director of Public Instruction has sent a circular to high schools and colleges under private management that the Government have under consideration a proposal to reduce the grants for buildings and equipments for teaching of scientific subjects from two-thirds to half and if so, whether the Government have come to any decision in the matter;

(c) whether the Government have decided as to how the savings made should be utilized if the grants are reduced as under (b); and

(d) whether the Government have received memorials from educational guilds and organizations that the grants should be enhanced and not reduced?

A.—(a) Yes. Since 1926.

(b) to (d) The hon. Member is referred to the answer to question No. 1902.

26th March 1929]

Alleged insecurity of teachers in educational institutions.

* 1908 Q.—MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether several representations have been made to the Government that the present want of security of tenure for teachers in educational institutions under private management and under local bodies leads to several difficulties and inconveniences; and

(b) whether there is any proposal before the Government for securing some satisfactory arrangement regarding the question referred to in (a) and if so, at what stage that consideration is and when a final decision may be expected?

A.—(a) Representations have been made to Government on the subject.

(b) The matter is under reference to the Director of Public Instruction and the Government hope to pass orders as early as possible.

Local Boards

Alleged signing of District Board bills by the Deputy Collector, Nilgiris.

* 1909 Q.—MR. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Deputy Collector, Ootacamund, Nilgiris, signs papers, bills and cheques on behalf of the Nilgiris District Board in spite of the fact that the Board has a President as well as Vice-President;

(b) if so, under what authority and why;

(c) whether it is a fact that there are only nine other elected members of the board as against thirteen consisting of Europeans, planters and nominated European officers including the Collector;

(d) whether it is a fact that the three nominated members consisting of the Anglo-Indian, Muhammadan and depressed class representatives almost always side with the planter *cum* official block;

(e) whether it is a fact that rural interests of Nilgiris district do not in consequence find expression in the District Board; and

(f) what measures Government propose to take to rectify this state of affairs?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have no information.

(c) Yes.

(d) & (e) The Government have no information.

(f)

MR. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR:—"May I know whether the Government cannot get the information?"

THE HON. DR. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"I do not know if any purpose will be served by obtaining the information."

MR. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR:—"Is not the hon. Minister aware that these local boards are intended to be a sort of training ground for non-officials, and such being the case, why should an official continue to do business there?"

[26th March 1929]

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“The Nilgiri District Board differs in many respects from other boards. Evidently, the hon. Member is not aware of it.”

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“Even then, it need not be so different as to avoid giving a chance to non-officials to get familiar with works. As regards question (f), what is the answer, Sir? I find here only some dots?”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“The Government do not propose to take any action.”

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“I see; I shall hereafter understand it so?”

Issue of licences to buses by district board presidents.

* 1910 Q.—Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have issued a Government Order that a district board president cannot refuse licences to buses that propose to run on the roads in his district; and if not, what the Government orders are;

(b) whether it is a fact that the Special Officer, Kistna District Board, has refused to renew the licences to some buses for 1929-30, though the said buses were running during the current official year under district board licences;

(c) whether complaints have been made to Government that this refusal of renewal of licences is causing enormous loss to the owners of these buses who have purchased them only last year; and what orders have been passed thereon; and

(d) whether the Government will be pleased to issue orders to the Special Officer, Kistna District Board, to renew licences to all persons who had such licences during the current year?

A.—(a) A copy of G.O. No. 1194, L. & M., dated 30th March 1927^a, is laid on the table.

(b) The Government have no information.

(c) & (d) No.

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“May I know whether it has come to the knowledge of Government that several District Board Presidents are not acting in accordance with the Government Order referred to in (a) of the answer?”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“I am not aware of any such omission.”

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“Will the hon. Minister please make an enquiry into this matter and see if any steps are necessary to amend the Local Boards Act in this respect?”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“The new Local Boards Act is going to contain a provision with regard to it.”

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—“Will he be pleased to call for information on the point raised in clause (b)?”

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—“I do not think any purpose will be served by calling for the information.”

26th March 1929],

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know whether a new Local Boards Act is coming into being at all ? "

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question does not arise. "

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" May I know whether the Government will see that the Government Order is acted upon by all the Presidents of District Boards when licences are issued ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" The Government Orders are supposed to be observed by all presidents. "

Nomination of an Adi-Andhra to the Kistna District Board.

* 1911 Q.—Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Special Officer, Kistna District Board, has omitted to nominate even one Adi-Andhra (member for Hindu depressed classes) for the Gudivada Taluk Board in the recent nominations ;

(b) how many members of the Hindu depressed classes (Adi-Andhras) have been nominated recently by the Special Officer, Kistna District Board, to each of the taluk boards of Nandigama, Kaikalur, Masulipatam, Nuzvid and Bezwada ; and

(c) whether the Government have made it obligatory that at least one member of the Hindu depressed classes should be nominated to every local body except where representation is secured for them in election and if not, why not ?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have no information.

(c) No. Section 9 (5) of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, only lays down that the appointing authority shall have due regard to the representation of Muhammadans of the depressed and backward classes and of other minorities.

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" May I know whether a member of the depressed classes is not necessarily to be on every taluk board ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" There is no compulsion on the part of the District Board with regard to nominations to taluk boards. "

Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" May I know whether the nomination of a member of the depressed classes on the taluk board will not help to remove untouchability in that area ? "

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" I believe it does ; but my experience in many of the taluk boards has been that most of the high class people like to seat the Adi-Dravidas away from the seats they are sitting on. "

Excise

Alleged resignation of the member representing Mannargudi Municipal Council from the Excise Licensing Board.

* 1912 Q.—Mr. K. S. SIVASUBRAHMANYA AYYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

• (a) whether it is a fact that the member representing the Municipal Council, Mannargudi, in the Excise Licensing Board has resigned ;

(b) if so, for what reasons ; and

(c) whether it is a fact that there is no representative of the Municipal Council in the Licensing Board now ?

[26th March 1929]

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The hon. Member presumably refers to the Excise Advisory Committee constituted for the Mannargudi Revenue Division. The Government are not aware that the fact is as suggested. They have called for a report.

Representation of Indian Christians on the South Kanara District Board.

* 1912-A Q.—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether it has been urged by any Indian Christian or Catholic Association League at Mangalore that there should be on the District Board of South Kanara at least three or four persons to represent the Indian Christians having regard to their population as also their progress educationally;

(b) whether the present number is only two;

(c) whether Government have nominated recently a Hindu lady to fill the vacancy of an Indian Catholic;

(d) why she was nominated in preference to Indian Christian ladies who are highly educated and qualified; and

(e) how many members of the Bant community to which the lady nominated belongs there are in the District Board?

A.—(a) No such representation is traceable.

(b) The number of Indian Christians on the South Kanara District Board is at present three.

(c) & (d) A Hindu lady was appointed in a vacancy previously filled by an Indian Catholic. No vacancy is earmarked for any particular community.

(e) Fourteen.

Mr. K. R. KARANT:—“What are the reasons, Sir, for the appointment of a lady when she belongs to a community which has got fourteen members already represented on the Board?”

Medical

Action taken on Dr. Norman Walker's recommendations regarding Vizagapatam Medical College.

* 1913 Q.—Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) the amount so far spent by the Government on the Vizagapatam Medical College;

(b) the annual expenditure to Government on account of this institution;

(c) whether the degrees awarded by this institution are recognized by the General Medical Council of Great Britain;

(d) what are the defects in this institution pointed out by Dr. Norman Walker; and

(e) whether the Government have made an estimate of the probable initial and recurring expenditure required to carry out Dr. Norman Walker's recommendations and if so, what it is?

26th March 1929]

A.—(a) & (b) The information is furnished below :—

Expenditure incurred on the Vizagapatam Medical College..

Year.	Expenditure on maintenance.	Expenditure on buildings, etc., incurred by the Public Works Department.	Total.
	RS.	RS.	RS.
1923-24	60,214	46,885	1,07,099
1924-25	1,28,681	83,165	2,11,846
1925-26	1,72,131	1,87,957	3,60,088
1926-27	2,35,060	1,28,306	3,63,366
1927-28	2,77,312	38,039	3,15,351
1928-29	2,05,505	Not available.	2,05,505
(up to end of January 1929.)			
Total	10,78,903	4,84,352	15,63,255

(c) The degrees are awarded by the Andhra University ; these have not yet been recognized by the General Medical Council of Great Britain.

(d) The defects pointed out in the joint report of Sir Norman Walker and Col. R. A. Needham were the following :—

- (1) Some of the professors had not sufficient experience of teaching ;
- (2) frequent changes and transfers of the teaching staff added to the disabilities of the students ;
- (3) the number of midwifery cases in the hospital was small and students had to be sent to Madras for training in this subject ;
- (4) facilities for training in the special departments had not been developed ; and
- (5) nursing was in charge of ward boys.

(e) No. The defects pointed out were of a comprehensive nature, mostly pertaining to the shortage of the teaching staff and their inexperience. The strength of the staff has been increased from 1st July 1927. As regards lack of experience, this can only be remedied gradually.

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ May I know, after spending Rs. 15,63,000 on this College at Vizagapatam, how many students are turned out every year ? ”

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—“ Notice.”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“ If it is only 10, is it worth while for the Government to spend such a large amount on it ? ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ That is a hypothetical question.”

[26th March 1929]

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“The Medical College authorities here are making huge attractions to another college in Vellore. When this one is not brought up to date and made recognizable by the Medical Council what is the necessity for spending such a large sum on that college?”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The question does not arise.”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“May I know what is the amount spent on the Madras Medical College in all?”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The question does not arise.”

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—“May I know whether there is not more scope in the Madras Medical College to train more men?”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The question does not arise.”

Rules regarding the L.M.P. course.

* 1914 Q.—Mr. R. NAGAN GOWDA : Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have issued an order on 16th November 1928 embodying almost the same terms as G.O. No. 555, P.H., dated 21st April 1922; and

(b) if so, what were the reasons for this step?

A.—The hon. Member is referred to the answer given to clause (a) of question No. 1036-A on 28th January 1929.

Extension of the scheme of honorary physicians to district hospitals.

* 1915 Q.—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA : With reference to the answer to my question No. 1594, dated the 1st March 1929, regarding the extension of the scheme of honorary physicians to the district hospitals, will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to place before the House the details of the scheme that have been so far worked out?

A.—No useful purpose will be served by placing on the table an incomplete scheme.

Public Health

Outbreak of cholera in the General Hospital.

* 1916 Q.—Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA : Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether there was a severe epidemic of cholera in the General Hospital in December last;

(b) how many patients were attacked by this disease in the hospital; how many of these were treated in the General Hospital itself and how many were sent to the Corporation Infectious Diseases Hospital;

(c) what was the mortality rate among them in the General Hospital and in the Infectious Diseases Hospital;

(d) whether any enquiry was held by the Government; and

(e) if so, whether they will be pleased to lay on the table the result of that enquiry?

26th March 1929]

A.—(a) to (e) Copies of the reports of the Committee appointed by the Surgeon-General to investigate the recent outbreak of cholera in the General Hospital together with the Surgeon-General's remarks thereon are laid on the table^a. The recommendations of the committee have been carried out.

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" May I know whether the reports were read by the hon. the Minister for Public Health ? "

. The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" That question is not admissible."

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" May I know what was the exact cause of this outbreak in the General Hospital ? "

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" It is given in five pages in the Appendix."

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" They say there that because there was cholera in the city, the General Hospital also had it. Then I ask, why there was no cholera in other big hospitals in the city—the Maternity Hospital, the Rayapuram Hospital, the Royapetta Hospital, the Christiana Rainy Hospital and the Kalyani hospital. In all these there was not even one case."

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" Does the hon. Member wish cholera to break out in those hospitals ? "

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" I should like to know exactly from the Minister how many cholera cases were treated in the General Hospital and how many of them were sent to the Isolation Hospital ? "

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" All of them are given in the Appendix."

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" I do not find it there. Still I am asking the hon. the Minister why there should be heavier mortality in the cases treated in the General Hospital, while in the case of those that were sent to the Isolation Hospital of the Corporation the recovery was 90 per cent ? "

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" The cases treated in the General Hospital are given here ; cases treated in the Isolation Hospital are not given here. There is no ground for a comparison between the two."

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" Why should cases of cholera be treated in the General hospital, when there is a special hospital for it ? "

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" The reason is given in the Appendix."

Dr. B. S. MALLAYYA :—" I do not find any reason ; still I should like to know from the hon. the Minister why the poor patients were sent to the Isolation Hospital and the rich patients were treated in the General Hospital ? "

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" That is giving information."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" In paragraph 3 it is stated that ' the most important points in connexion with the enquiry are to find out how the patients might have become infected.' May I know what action Government have taken to guard against the mistakes that seem to have operated in this case ? "

[26th March 1929]

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" It is also given in the Appendix. There they say : ' the question of fly-proofing latrines and kitchens in all hospitals is being considered '. They have been carried out."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" May I know on what basis the authorities in the General Hospital sent a certain number of patients suffering from cholera to the Isolation Hospital and retained some in the General Hospital for treatment? "

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" What is the paragraph in the report to which he refers? "

Agriculture

Number and cost of breeding stations in 1927-28.

* 1917 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI : Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) the number and cost of each breeding station in 1927-28 ;

(b) where each is located ; and

(c) how many of them are in Telugu districts?

A.—(a) & (b) The following are the figures for both plant breeding stations and cattle breeding stations :—

Station.	Expenditure.
	RS.
Paddy breeding station, Maruteru	17,248
Do. Aduturai	8,973
Do. Pattambi	15,451
Do. Coimbatore	6,259
Cotton breeding station, Coimbatore	10,571
Do. Koilpatti	9,491
Millets breeding station, Coimbatore	5,668
Cattle breeding station, Hosur	86,024
Do. Chintaldevi	21,612
Buffalo breeding station, Guntur	8,983

The above does not include the establishment charges.

(c) Three.

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" May I know from the hon. the Minister whether more breeding stations will be started, seeing that there are only three for the Telugu districts? "

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" It will be considered, Sir."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" May I know what return is got from these plant breeding stations? "

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" Notice."

Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" Am I to understand that no information has been received from these breeding stations? "

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" Oh, yes. Details are available and I shall call for them if desired."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I know whether the hon. the Minister has considered the necessities of the Ceded districts with regard to the establishment of these breeding stations? "

26th March 1929]

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR:—"It is proposed to open a millet station at Adoni."

The ZAMINDAR OF GOLLAPALLI:—"Will the hon. Minister be pleased to state whether there is a proposal to abolish the farm at Chintaladevi, Nellore district?"

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR:—"There is no such proposal."

Fisheries

Work done by the Director of Fisheries.

* 1918 Q.—Mr. C. GOPALA MENON: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

- (a) when the post of the Director of Fisheries was permanently created;
- (b) how many times and for what period the Director of Fisheries has been either on leave or employed on other duty;
- (c) what were the arrangements made to carry on his work during his absence;
- (d) whether it is a fact that several proposals relating to the working of the Fisheries department are allowed to lie over pending the arrival of the permanent Director of Fisheries; and
- (e) if the answer to (d) is in the affirmative, what these proposals are?

A.—(a) In July 1915.

(b) Mr. Hornell, the late Director of Fisheries, was on leave from the 15th January to 14th November 1920. Dr. Sundara Raj was on leave from the 16th May to 14th July 1926 and again from the 1st July 1928 to 28th February 1929. He was also employed on special duty under the Government of Bihar and Orissa for a period of three weeks from the 8th June 1928.

(c) During Mr. Hornell's absence on leave and when Dr. Sundara Raj was on leave from the 16th May to 14th July 1926, the Director of Industries held additional charge of the post of the Director of Fisheries. When Dr. Sundara Raj was on special duty for three weeks from 8th June 1928 and on leave from 1st July 1928 to 28th February 1929, the Superintendent, Government Museum, was appointed to hold full additional charge of the post of Director of Fisheries.

(d) & (e) The only proposal which was allowed by Government to be deferred pending the return of Dr. Sundara Raj from leave was the publication of a bulletin of important marketable fishes in the presidency.

Public Works

Acquisition of the North Georgetown playground for Public Works Department buildings.

* 1919 Q.—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

(a) whether the North Georgetown playground in the Madras City has recently been given to the Public Works Department for making an addition to their buildings;

(b) whether it is proposed to erect police lines on the adjoining plot of ground;

[26th March 1929]

(c) whether the Government have considered the undesirability of thus depriving the children of this congested area of the only open space available to them for play;

(d) whether the playgrounds used by school children in any other place in Madras City have similarly been taken away in the course of this year; and

(e) whether the Government will lay on the table of the House a copy of the correspondence that took place recently between them and the Physical Education Committee regarding such a question?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) The Government propose to reserve for a model playground an adjoining plot which opens on to the Portuguese Church Street.

(d) No playground formally assigned has been resumed. There are, however, certain cases where private schools are allowed to use vacant Government land as playgrounds and in one such case Government has been compelled to withdraw the permission as the land is required for public purposes.

(e) The letters ^a referred to are laid on the table.

MR. F. E. JAMES:—"Will the hon. the Minister be pleased to state, with reference to (c), whether the Government have already reserved that plot and if so, whether it is larger or smaller than the previous one."

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR:—"Notice, Sir."

MR. F. E. JAMES:—"May I ask whether he will consider the advisability of Government's adopting a policy of not resuming plots which are set aside as playgrounds until alternative plots have been laid down?"

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR:—"In this case, the alternative plot has been set down before the resumption."

MR. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"May I know, Sir, whether the Government are aware that the alternative plot is not as big as the other plot which they have resumed and also of the fact that it is not located in a place which is accessible to the people of the locality from which the other plot which was resumed?"

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR:—"I do not think so. The new plot is adjacent to the old plot and is very easily accessible."

[Note.—An asterisk * at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the member.]

II

FURTHER DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR 1929-30.

DEMAND VI—IRRIGATION.

The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS:—"Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move—

'that the Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 40,000 under Demand VI—Irrigation.'"

This is to provide for improvements to the Vizzaswaram head sluice, Godavari Western delta.

26th March 1929]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is ' that the Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 40,000 under Demand VI—Irrigation."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" On a point of order. I have already raised last year this question about further demands. . ."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" As far as the question of further demands is concerned, the hon. Member need not argue to reopen an established practice."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" You were pleased to rule last year that my contention about that further demands should cover only new matter; that is, you were pleased to agree with me on other points but you disagreed with me. . ."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I allowed further demands last year."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" There was one point, Sir, in your ruling which is to be found in the Proceedings of the Council in which you conceded my point, namely, that these further demands should cover new matter not contemplated at the time of the original budget; and, Sir, you were pleased to look into the subject-matter of the further demands last year and came to the conclusion, after satisfying yourself, that they covered new matter. May I submit, Sir, that this further demand and the next further demand do not cover new matter? These have not arisen since the framing of the budget for the next year. 'New matters' has been defined in the House of Commons by the Chairman of Committee, as a matter which must have arisen since the submission of the original estimates to the House. You will notice, Sir, that both, with regard to this and the next demand, the scheme was already included as Part II schemes for 1929-30. Paragraph 2 of the explanatory note says 'The Chief Engineer originally included the scheme in his list of Part II schemes which he submitted in October last but as then the estimate was not before the Government and as it was also not known when it was likely to be sanctioned the scheme was deleted from the list of Part II schemes.' I submit, Sir, that this is not a matter which has arisen since the submission of the original budget. The matter was before the Government and for their own reason they have put it aside, for the simple reason that the estimate was not ready."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I do not agree with the hon. Member."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" With regard to the second further demand."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" That will come later."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Am I to take it that in your opinion that this is a new matter?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Yes."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" Then I decide to oppose this demand. Sir, a further demand is, I submit, under the present ruling of yours, an exceptional procedure to be resorted to by Government, only under exceptional circumstances. I am bound by your ruling that these demands are in order. Subject to that, I would argue that the House should examine the further demands and should not sanction any of them, unless they are satisfied that it is a matter which could not be included in the original budget."

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[26th March 1929]

"If the hon. Members will read the explanatory note, they will find that this is an old scheme which the Government had examined, and they should have been in a position to include it in the original budget itself, if they wanted to do so; and as a matter of fact, the Chief Engineer originally included the scheme in the list of Part II schemes, which he submitted to Government in October last, but then as the estimate was not before the Government and as it was also not known when it was likely to be sanctioned, the scheme was deleted from the list of Part II scheme. Why was not the estimate then before the Government? Whose fault was it? I am particularly addressing my observation, if I may, to the hon. the Finance Member and the Finance Secretary, because after all they are the eyes and ears of this House so far as these budget estimates are concerned. If the department is lax in preparing estimates for the next year and have them included in the budget, are they to be encouraged to come here with a further demand? I can understand their doing so in unforeseen cases such as floods or famine or something of that sort. This procedure of bringing forward further demands should not be encouraged; otherwise the anxiety of the treasury to exercise control over the spending departments will be made nugatory. I should like to know why the estimate was not before the Government. Did the department commit any default in preparing estimates? Then, Sir, 'as it was also not known when it was likely to be sanctioned.' May I know, Sir, whose sanction, is it the sanction of the Government or of the Finance Department or of the Finance Committee? Then, it says, the scheme was deleted from the list of Part II schemes. By whom was it deleted? Was it by the Government?"

"The third paragraph says that 'the Chief Engineer submitted an estimate amounting to Rs. 1,21,000 for the scheme. It has been long delayed'. I agree. At the end of the third paragraph, the note says 'the season when the work has to be carried out is during the period of closure of the canals which is from 1st May'. This 1st of May, I hope, is a fixed date. That shows that the Government should have known that the canals would be closed from the 1st of May. They could have come forward with this demand earlier."

"It seems to me, Sir, that if further demands are to be encouraged by this House, the whole idea of the budget would become nugatory. As it is, there is no limit either in point of money or in point of objects or in point of time for further demands. Whereas excess demands and supplementary demands have got statutory restrictions placed upon them. The category of further demand, unless it is closely watched, may swallow up crores and crores of rupees. I submit, Sir, that unless the Finance Department scrutinises these demands very carefully, and unless those demands which could not be included in the original budget are only brought to this House, the control of this House which is already very limited will still further become nugatory. I therefore venture to submit to this House that this demand should be very carefully examined by the Finance Department and that an assurance should be given by the Finance Department that in spite of all the care on its part, it was impossible to include it in the original demand. Until this is done, we should oppose demands of this nature."

"Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU:—"Mr. President, Sir, I am glad that my hon. Friend Mr. Satyamurti did not ask the House to reject this demand."

26th March 1929]' [Mr. D. Narayana Raju]

Whatever may be the technical difficulties with regard to the rules for further demands, I hope the Council will pass this further demand. These improvements to the Vijjeswaram head sluice are long overdue. I am indeed glad that the Government have come forward at least now to effect these improvements. In this connexion, I would like to have some further information from the Government as to the nature of the improvements contemplated as to whether they intend to construct new vents or merely widen the existing ventways. I should also like to know what is the extra discharge that the Government hopes to provide by these improvements. I also want to know whether the Government have examined the question, whether the canals leading from the head sluice have got the necessary capacity to carry on the extra discharge and whether they contemplate any improvement to the canals also or not. I should like to have some information on these points."

* The hon. Sir NORMAN MAJORIBANKS :—" Mr. President, Sir, I can tell the hon. Member that the estimate contains provision for the construction of additional vents to the head sluice. With regard to other details he asked I regret I am not sufficiently familiar with engineering details to be able to say much. As has been stated in the explanatory note the Western delta has to work to a duty of 110, while the Eastern and the Central sections of the Godavari delta get supplies at a duty of 77 and 52; and the object is to increase the discharge to the Western delta; but I am sorry that I am unable to give details as to the exact amount of the extra discharge asked for by the Member. I can assure him that all these things have been very carefully worked out by the Chief Engineer and the scheme was laid before the Finance Committee for scrutiny."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The motion is that the Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 40,000 under Demand VI—Irrigation."

The demand was put to the House and carried and the grant made.

DEMAND VIII—ELECTRICITY.

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—" Mr. President, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move—

' That the Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 3,56,400 under Demand VIII—Electricity' to provide for additional expenditure on the Glen-Morgan Hydro-electric scheme in 1929-30.

" The reasons for this demand are fully explained in the note that has been circulated to hon. Members. As a matter of fact the Chief Engineer has surrendered this amount that was provided for in the current year's budget to the Government. He could not spend it owing to obstruction to road traffic and also on account of the land slips in the Nilgiris Railway. There was also delay in obtaining the necessary machinery and plants. So, the proposal has practically to be taken to the next year."

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—" Mr. President, Sir, I oppose this demand. I gave some of my reasons the other day when this demand came up for consideration in this House. Now, I find there are very many other reasons to show why this demand should be opposed. This scheme, I submit, Sir, never came before this House for consideration at all. There was an allotment in the last budget for about Rs. 10 lakhs for the Pykhara scheme and

[Mr. K. V. R. Swami]

[26th March 1929]

that provision was made last year. The predecessor of the present Law Member promised this House that there would be a big Pykhara scheme and that the scheme would supply not only electricity to various places but also to various concerns, the first and foremost being the South Indian Railway. He was informing this House that the Railway Company were negotiating with the Government to take a very big contract so that they might electrify their railways with the powers supplied from this scheme. The Government also promised at that time that a Paper Mill will be started at this place and there were materials there and that power would also be used for this purpose. The other day my friend the Law Member stated that there was really one scheme for starting a match industry near this place and the company with which they started negotiations did not agree to start any mill of that sort and that scheme failed.

12
noon.

"Now, the only purpose for which this grant is asked is to supply electricity to Ootacamund tea plantations. Of course, whenever schemes of this sort are started the benefit is promised to other people also. In this case it is said that the Coimbatore Mills also will be benefited immediately and other places later on. The big Pykhara scheme has been split up into three parts and only one of these parts is proposed to be taken up now. When in the last budget funds were provided for the whole Pykhara scheme it was said that that scheme would supply electricity to many places including even Madras. Everybody was promised something under that scheme. (A voice: Northern Circars.) We do not want schemes of this sort for Northern Circars.

"Sir, the Government, instead of coming directly to this House with a demand for this scheme, converted a part of the amount sanctioned for the Pykhara scheme for use on this without the sanction of this House. This is the first time that the Glen-Morgan scheme comes before the House for consideration. I oppose this grant because I am quite sure that this money can be better spent on irrigation and other schemes. This scheme does not fetch more than 8 per cent. Further, I very much doubt whether the Government would not come again for a further grant for this same scheme saying that this amount is not sufficient. Again, Sir, there is no urgency in regard to this matter. The machinery for the purchase of which Rs. 4,74,200 had been allotted did not arrive in time and the amount was not utilized. There is no urgency about it. I fear that even after the money is voted for this scheme and the work is completed, this House will be told that unless the other two parts are sanctioned the scheme could not be worked with any profit and therefore the House should vote for further demands also. In that way a huge sum will be spent on an object which will not give a return of more than 6 or 8 per cent. If this expenditure from provincial revenues is made for purposes of irrigation it would fetch more than 400 per cent. I oppose this demand."

* Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—"Sir, I beg to move—

'To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,56,400 for Electricity by Rs. 100.'

"My object in moving this motion is to discuss the necessity for selecting members of the depressed and backward communities for appointment as clerks, etc. Sir, I do not know why a certain section of the Indian community is so largely employed under this scheme. As I have already said in this House, owing to economic conditions, the depressed classes are very badly off. Apart from that, whenever they go to the various offices

26th March 1929]

[Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai]

for employment, the insistence on qualifications blocks their way. I request the hon. the Law Member to kindly see that the members of my community are given a chance to serve as clerks, store-keepers, etc. I do not say that they may be given higher appointments or technical appointments as I know that specialists are required for such posts. They ought to have a knowledge of electricity."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“(After a pause.) For want of a seconder the motion is lost.”

** Mr. C. GOPALA MENON :—“Mr. President, Sir, I understand that this scheme is an auxiliary scheme to the big Hydro-electric (Pykhara) scheme which was originally intended to be started. The purpose of this scheme is not only to develop industries and electrify the railways, but also to improve irrigation. One of the essential requirements of the province is that we want cheap electricity. It is a dire necessity not only for industrial development, but also for various other purposes. Therefore, this Glen-Morgan scheme which the Engineer thinks would in course of time be self-supporting on account of the promises held out by the railways and the various industrial concerns, is likely to be a fruitful affair. And, as I pointed out it will also help irrigating the lands in the neighbourhood. The hon. Mr. Swami pointed out that electricity will be of use in the development of the match industry. We want cheap electric power for the development of our other industries also say, for our cottage industries. We want electricity for working aluminium industry, for working the aluminium ores great deal of heating power is required in the furnaces. We have plenty of aluminium ores in the country and with the generating power of electricity the industry can be developed to a greater extent. For preparing caustic soda necessary for soap-making, we also want electricity. Caustic soda is prepared by passing electricity through salt water by the process called electrolysis. You all know we have a soap factory and with the use of electricity caustic soda and other chemicals required not only for making soaps but also other things could be manufactured very cheaply. If we can get electricity cheap, we solve the fuel problem in respect of our industries. But according to Mr. Forbes' report, I find that the cost per unit of electricity will be about 0·8 annas or about 9 pies per unit. (Dr. B. S. Mallayya :—‘We are paying 8 annas per unit.’)

“According to Forbes' report, I may tell Dr. Mallayya that electricity by Pykhara scheme will cost only 8 pies for industrial purposes and 4 annas for lighting purposes per unit. I may in this connexion point out that this rate when compared with the rates prevailing in other parts of the world is high. In England the cost is only 3 pies per unit by making electricity out of coal; in Scandanavia, it is a bit more than a pie and in America it is less than a pie. Of course, our scheme is in its infancy and we cannot at this stage make comparisons with schemes of other countries. When our industrialists and agriculturists come forward offering to take electricity there will be the possibility of the cost being reduced. In any case in all parts of the world attempts are being made for generating current by harnessing water power. I therefore think that in the interests of industrial development in this country and in order to make a trial to see how far industrial as well as agricultural development is possible with the help of electricity we ought to support this demand. I have therefore much pleasure in supporting this motion of the hon. the Law Member.”

[26th March 1929]

* Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I am sorry that my hon. Friend has raised an objection to this demand. We will see how matters stand. Last year, the whole matter was discussed and a grant was made for 1928-29. This year again this question was discussed in connexion with a grant which was ultimately passed. It so happens that the original plan could not be carried out and the money not fully spent on account of some defects which were not anticipated. Therefore merely as a matter of adjustment and with a view to give effect to the various resolutions passed in connexion with the grants this adjustment is now asked for. No doubt the resolution originally passed by the House was for the whole Pykhara scheme. But the whole scheme is not now proposed to be carried out all at once. The scheme has been split into three parts and one part only is now proposed to be taken up. The present Chief Engineer has suggested that instead of spending a huge amount on the whole scheme at once it would be advisable to start work on one part of it to begin with, so that the investment on the first part may fetch some return. By this arrangement, each scheme as soon as it is completed, would pay interest. I believe that on this portion we are going to get about 8 per cent or so. The important question for consideration in connexion with this scheme is whether we should encourage the generation and utilization of hydro-electric power. We know what is being done in Bombay in this connexion and how it is progressing industrially. The City of Bombay which was once called the city of smoke is now full of light on account of the supply of electricity. If this electricity can be made available to our province, the cost of fuel and coal would go down. We have now to get coal from Bengal through the railways and our forests are being denuded of firewood trees. No doubt Coimbatore and other places outside the Nilgiris would not get power under this portion of the scheme; but this is only a part of the big scheme. If the railways agree to take power—probably the Railway Board is bargaining now and I am sure it will be the first to agree to utilize electricity for the railways—the scheme would be a thorough success and the fuel and coal which now go to feed the railways would be released and the cost of firewood would go down considerably. The mills in Coimbatore which now consume large quantities of fuel and coal have agreed to take electric energy for running the mills. As a matter of fact, those who know the spinning industry, know also that the yarn produced by electric power is better and finer than the yarn manufactured by steam. So, the supply of cheap electrical energy will also improve the textile industry. In any case if we look at the prosperous condition of the neighbouring State of Mysore brought about by the Sivasamudram Works, we need no argument to introduce the same in our province also.

12-15
p.m.

"There is no doubt that one very reasonable objection was raised by Mr. Swami Nayudu the other day as well as to-day. Sometimes all this money is used for the purchase of big machinery from England. I appeal to this Government and to the hon. the Law Member to see that as much money as possible is spent on Indian-made goods. Recently, the Tariff Board has been asked to go into this question of having some import duties levied on some foreign wiring materials. I am sure that Messrs. Tata & Co. and some other Indian firms will be able to supply wiring materials and other materials that may be necessary. Unfortunately, we do not have big electrical machines made in India. But I suppose the starting of such big

26th March 1929] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

power stations will give sufficient impetus for starting new factories. The paper manufacture referred to by Mr. Swami Nayudu, I believe, comes only under the Papanasam Hydro-electric works. That does not come under the Pykhara scheme. The Papanasam scheme will be taken into consideration a little later on when the Railway Board is prepared to take up some power produced there. The paper or match factory may be helping the Government to take up some energy. In any case, so far as the present scheme is concerned, this is only a part of the Pykhara. It will be a great benefit to this province and I request Mr. Swami Nayudu not to oppose it but to support the motion."

* Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" I rise again, not to speak on the merits of the scheme, but on the financial aspect of it, in the vain hope that by reiterating the argument again and again I shall be able to rouse the conscience of the Finance Department. This is a case where the spending department is not able to spend the amount granted to it, surrenders the amount and goes to the Finance Department saying that it wants a further demand for the sum it has surrendered this year. I should like to know some more facts than are given in the explanatory note. The estimated cost of this project is Rs. 12,20,600. The Chief Engineer for Hydro-electric Development expected to spend the sum of Rs. 8,30,600 during the current official year, and on this basis the balance of the estimate, viz., Rs. 3,90,000, was provided in the next year's budget. The House has already voted for Rs. 2,90,000 for this project. Then comes the intriguing sentence stating the transport difficulties brought about by slips on the roads and railways. I have a hazy recollection that these slips took place during the last monsoon which certainly was before the time when the budget was presented to this House. If all the expenditure could not be incurred owing to these slips on the railway lines and the roads, the spending department could have known that they could not spend the amount that year. Why did they not tell the House that they could not spend the money and wanted an extra sum for the next year? Then also they speak of the delay in the shipment of penstocks and electrical machinery from England. When was this delay? When did it come to the notice of the spending department? Did it come to its notice after the 2nd or 3rd March? Did the slips happen earlier? Were not the Government in a position to know and should they not be in a position to know how much they could spend for the rest of the year at least in January or February of this year? Was it necessary for them to wait till after the presentation of the budget and then say owing to shipping delays which must have been months before or owing to railway slips and road slips which took place six months before, the department could not spend it and therefore we come for a further demand? A sum of Rs. 3,56,400 has been surrendered by the Chief Engineer on this account. Sir, I am not quite familiar with the rules governing surrenders, but, as a layman, I believe that surrenders take place naturally after the official year is out. May I know whether there is any time-limit before which surrenders should be made? What is that limit? Was this amount surrendered before that date? If there is no time-limit, why has a date not been fixed so as to enable the Government to put the increased demand in the budget itself? If they cannot spend after the 1st March or some other date, they could have fixed a particular date before which the spending department could inform the Finance Department that so much of the year's grant could not be spent this year, and therefore they want provision to be made for the next year. Then, Sir, the other sentence :

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[26th March 1929]

is it necessary to increase the provision for next year by a corresponding amount? How does it follow that they have any guarantee that the delay in the shipment of penstocks and electrical machinery ceased to exist or is it merely in the belief that they will again be surrendered and then can ask for a further demand? Then, Sir, as the project is expected to be completed by September next, the commitment of the Government is that they will be able to spend nearly 7½ lakhs between the 1st April and the end of September, that is within six months. Is it, Sir, a provision based upon any knowledge of facts? Have they got any knowledge in their possession to justify them in the belief that before the end of September next they will be able to spend Rs. 3,90,000 already provided for and also Rs. 3,56,400 which together make up 7½ lakhs? Then, Sir, 'it is considered inadvisable to postpone the demand for the additional grant required for the next year till the next meeting of the Legislative Council which is not likely to be held before August next'. This is the first time I get the information. I do not know if your office has got any information about the date of the next meeting of the Legislative Council. The Government in their explanatory note for an additional provision for the Glen-Morgan Hydro-electric scheme say in an indirect manner, when the next meeting of the Council is to take place. I have no doubt any member of our party has heard and I do not think you have yourself heard when the Council is to be held. Supposing this is to be held some time in August, is there any guarantee according to the programme of work furnished by the Chief Engineer that he will be able to spend more than Rs. 3,90,000 before August next? It is only on this basis that they can come now for a further demand. If, as a matter of fact, at least till the next meeting of the Legislative Council they are able to go on with a provision of Rs. 3,90,000, they can well wait till the next meeting of the Council, and come for a supplementary demand. There should be some facts stated, Mr. President, which would satisfy this Council that before August next the department would spend Rs. 3,90,000 and also at least some portion, if not the whole of the extra Rs. 3,56,400. I therefore submit that if these further demands are to be encouraged in this fashion, surrenders will become frequent, the spending departments will exercise no control over their expenditure and will merely depend upon Government moving further demands before this House. In any case, it is not a new matter or a new service necessitating or justifying a further demand."

* Mr. A. KALESWARA RAO :—" I also wish to oppose the demand on its merits. The electricity schemes are no doubt good in themselves and help the industrial development. But spending huge sums on these big schemes at this stage when we are defective in irrigation schemes, for example the Tungabhadra and Kistna projects which would fertilise an arid area which is suffering from constant droughts, when money is not forthcoming for such schemes that we should think of investigating into big Hydro-electric schemes and give electricity to some areas is premature. We want food first and then these luxuries and other comforts. So far as this scheme is 'concerned, it helps the municipality of Ootacamund and a number of tea plantations. The municipality of Ootacamund can better take care of itself by getting some loan from the Government and carrying on its own electric schemes and the tea plantations also may be left to take care of themselves. Except for those two parties just now the scheme is admittedly not useful. As this is a huge scheme known as the Pykhara scheme, I object that huge commitments

26th March 1929]

[Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao.]

be made to these schemes. Of course, if I am not going on an indelicate ground, we people who are agitating for separating the Andhra districts into a separate province have to object. Another reason is that most of the money that is now sanctioned for this scheme will be spent in purchasing machinery in England. The complaint about the Mettur project has been that there has not been sufficient advertisement in the papers on the Continent and America and that the special officer has been sent direct to England for purchasing all the machinery there. These electrical schemes are naturally of huge machinery, and in the present circumstances this money is being spent by the executive which is not responsible to the Legislature. It is expected that these sums will be spent for the benefit of the British manufacturers at great loss to the taxpayer of this country. The machinery is known to be cheaper and at least as efficient on the Continent and also in America than in England and therefore any risk of benefiting the manufacturers of Great Britain to the detriment of the Indian taxpayer has also to be avoided. Therefore, I think that any money to be spent on these electric schemes would be a waste or at any rate will not be so useful as they would be if the schemes are postponed till we get full responsible Government. I would therefore object to the taking up of the scheme at this stage."

* The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I have very little to add. As a matter of fact my friend Mr. Swami Nayudu opposed the motion for the grant itself when the demand for the hydro-electric scheme came before the House and Mr. Wood on that occasion and my friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar on that occasion as well as on the present occasion and my friend Mr. Gopala Menon on the present occasion have answered all the criticisms. I do not think there is any necessity to spend more time of the Council in my answering to the objection now raised."

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

III

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1928-29.

GRANT XXVII—FISHERIES—TRANSFERRED.

12-30
p.m.

* The hon. Mr. M. R. SEIURATNAM AYYAR :—"On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move—

'that Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 16,380 under Grant XXVII—Fisheries—Transferred.'

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—"I second it."

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

GRANT XXXIV—AGENCY TRACTS—RESERVED.

* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—"Mr. President, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move—

'that Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 under Grant XXXIV—Agency Tracts—Reserved.'

"Sir, this is a token demand for obtaining the approval of the House for certain works being undertaken in regard to urgent repairs to the roof of

[Sir Norman Marjoribanks]

[26th March 1929]

the prisoners' wards in the District Jail, Koraput. The money can be met by appropriation but as the work is a new work, this token grant has to be moved."

The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :—" I second it."

The demand was put and carried and the grant made.

GRANT XXXVI—LOANS AND ADVANCES BY PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT.

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" On the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I beg to move—

'that Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 under Grant XXXVI—Loans and Advances by Provincial Government.'

" Sir, this is a token grant in order to give a loan of Rs. 24,000 to the Board of Commissioners for Hindu Religious Endowments. It has not been found possible for these Commissioners—this has been pointed out in the explanatory note that has been circulated to the Members—to collect enough money to carry on the administration of the Board. The Board has promised that, as far as this loan is concerned, they will repay it within six months with interest. Under these circumstances I hope hon. Members will have no objection to this loan being granted to the Board."

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" I second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Some hon. Members have given notice of token cuts. One of them is by Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai to discuss the necessity for appointing depressed class members to temple committees. Another is by Mr. Biswanath Das to discuss the work of the Commissioners and for other purposes. The third is by Mr. K. R. Karant as to the necessity of having more than one committee for South Kanara. I have just now received another notice given by Zamindar of Gollapalli to discuss the heavy machinery of the department and also to suggest simple and effective means of safeguarding the endowments. I wish to know how far these motions are relevant to this supplemental demand. In supplemental grants we have always confined ourselves to the cut motions completely relevant to the purpose of the grant. Here the Government wants to stand in the position of a creditor and the Board wants to stand in the position of a borrower. Therefore the questions relating to the Government's position to lend money and the position of the Board to borrow money are, I think, relevant matters for consideration. Before I give my ruling however if hon. Members want to convince me as to how their motions are relevant I shall be glad to hear their arguments."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" Sir, in the first place when we have to sanction a sum of money. . ."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" This is not sanctioning a sum of money."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" I know it, Sir. I am coming to the question of sanction. Sir, a sum of money, be it either borrowing."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" This is only borrowing. . ."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" I know, I know. I am coming to my point."

" Sir, even if it is a question of borrowing, there are cases where the Government have come forward with motions to write off portions or full

26th March 1929] [Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo]

sums of money and in some cases for remission of interest also. This Hindu Religious Endowments Board, I think, was granted a sum exceeding 2 lakhs of rupees just three years back and we have heard nothing about that sum."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"We have heard of that sum in the explanatory note to the supplemental demand."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"Excepting this supplemental demand I do not think we have ever heard anything about the previous loan. Nor have we heard of any action being taken about the realization of that loan by the Government on the one hand or of its payment by the Board on the other. In these circumstances we have no option but to come forward with these motions to discuss how far the Board would be able to pay back the money and whether or not it is desirable to give again to the Board a further sum and if so, what is the security for the money to be given."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"All these things are for consideration of the House. But your motion relates to the activities of the Board regarding their own functions."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"Because I want to refer to them to show how they effect collection."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I never doubted about the question of collection being raised in this discussion. Their negligence in collecting can be questioned. Their business capacity can be questioned."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"With due submission to you, Sir, I have to bring to the notice of this House the work of the Commissioners in its various aspects. While referring to the collection of its dues, we have to refer to the rate of interest that is levied as also the register of endowments that will have to be kept by the Board as laid down in the Act. This is very essential because if they have kept the register we could easily find out what are the assets and liabilities of the Board. It is a statutory obligation on the Board that they should keep a register of endowments, but they have not fulfilled this obligation. I think it is incumbent on the hon. Members of this House to take this aspect of the matter into consideration. The question of provident fund which I have referred to in my motion may not be very necessary and I have no objection to give it up. The other things are essential and I think we should have to refer to them. Therefore I submit that the cut motion is in order."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I have given this point my best consideration. The only point relevant to the discussion is the solvency of the Board and its capacity to collect the money and also to discharge this debt. Any discussion beyond this will not be relevant and therefore the token cuts as proposed are not relevant except that of Mr. K. V. R. Swami. Even there I would suggest to him to oppose the grant itself because the principles involved are the same as what he wants to discuss, viz, the negligence of the Board in not collecting the amounts due to it. Whether the Board should be taken as a safe debtor is the relevant point for consideration and therefore he may oppose the grant and may adduce all the reasons. After all this is a token demand."

[26th March 1929]

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"If my motion is disallowed it is all right. But if it is not disallowed I wish to move it. If my motion is carried, it would mean that the Board ought to do better work and not sleep as they have been doing in the past."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I would suggest to hon. Members that if this motion is carried it means that the purpose for which this grant is asked for is not accepted by the House."

(Voices : 'So the loan may be given.')

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The object of this cut motion is to discuss the neglect of the Religious Endowments Board in not collecting its dues. That means that the Board is not in a position to borrow on account of its negligence."

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI :—"My own opinion is that if this cut motion is passed it only means that this House is of opinion that the Board is not carrying out its duties and that they are not collecting their dues properly. With all that the House may not refuse the grant and may give another chance to the Board to show better work and if it does not turn out better work it will refuse the grant next time. So the object of this cut motion is simply to make the Board bestir themselves and do better work. So, Sir, I beg to move that this allotment of Rs. 100 be reduced by Re. 1."

"Sir, my object in moving this motion is this: that we are quite convinced that this Board is not doing any good work at all. They are satisfied with writing the report and complimenting themselves with the various activities they have undertaken during last year. A sum of 3 lakhs of rupees was lent to the Board some two years back and they were supposed to pay it by instalments. They could not pay even one instalment. The first instalment had to be paid on 1st May 1928 and another in the month of March 1928 and so on. Out of the moneys lent to them to the extent of 3 lakhs they have to pay up to date Rs. 1,26,695. They have not paid a pie and they have come again to this House with another application for lending them moneys. They have to collect to the extent of 7 lakhs of rupees and they have neglected to collect a lot of moneys. They have collected only Rs. 2,46,000. Out of the 7 lakhs due to them there is still a balance of Rs. 4,29,000 and odd. When they have yet to collect to the extent of 4 lakhs of rupees they have come before this House for a loan of Rs. 24,000. My belief is that they have not done their duty properly. If they had done their duties in sufficient time, they need not have resorted to make these applications. Perhaps they thought it was an easier method for them to come to the Government and ask for loans than taking any trouble to collect the moneys due to them. In their annual report at page 36 they say referring to coercive process 'the filing of applications in courts under section 70 is attended with various difficulties as set forth in the Board's letter . . . and so on.' They were given this special privilege because it was thought that by simply filing the application they should be enabled to execute their demands. That is the simplest process that can be given to anybody. Yet they did not avail themselves of this process and tell us it was beset with various difficulties. The only thing that is not beset with any difficulty for them seems to be to put in applications for loans to this Government time and again. That is the process they have found out to be very easy. Now at the close of the fasli under report, they say, 'the

26th March 1929]

[Mr. K. V. R. Swami]

inspecting officers of the Board have been directly authorized by the Board to collect contributions on their giving satisfactory security to the Board.' That is the process they have adopted after three years. After three years they have found out that they have to authorize the inspectors to collect the money provided they give some security. Still the matter is pending, but the inspectors, if they so choose, will have to collect the money after giving the security first.

“Of course, that is a sound rule. At the end of three years they have found that they are not able to collect the money due to them; they say that the collections will be made later on. It is stated that the actual and direct collection of arrears was entrusted to these officers only recently. Only recently they came to the conclusion that the money should be collected and they have entrusted this work to these officers. My fear is this, Mr. President. This Board is asking money now; it is stated that it will be repaid. The hon. Minister also stated that this Board has undertaken to repay this amount. He did not tell us why they have not fulfilled the promises made by them previously. Perhaps there was not a good case for the hon. Minister to make out. The Board has made many promises before. It is indebted to the Government to the extent of rupees one lakh and a quarter. He simply said that this money would be repaid; I very much doubt it. Some time later the Board will say that it cannot pay this amount and it will ask the Government to write off this loan. That is the easiest way for it for getting over the difficulty. At page 38 of the report the Board says ‘the Board is hardly able to keep its work going and with the contributions that are likely to be realized, it will not be possible for it to repay the loans at all and the Government have accordingly been requested to write them off.’ This piece of information was withheld from us purposely. The Board is saying now ‘please pay Rs. 24,000 now; afterwards I shall send an application to have this amount written off. The hon. the Chief Minister expects the amount to be paid with interest. Under these circumstances, I request the House to support this cut motion. These people went to sleep for three years and they woke up at the end of three years. The Board must be told that what it has been doing is not at all proper, and that it has no right to ask for a further loan before it explains why it has not paid the previous instalments. With these words I move this cut motion.”

Mr. C. S. GOVINDARAJA MUDALIYAR:—“I beg to second the motion.”

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya:—“Mr. President, Sir, you were pleased to rule my motion out of order under the Standing Orders of this Council, a procedure which appears to be more rigid than that of the House of Commons. I would request you to give us some more latitude since a token motion is brought forward and not a total grant. The Religious Endowments Act came into operation in the year 1925 and the Board of Commissioners were appointed shortly afterwards. If the Government had taken pains to select proper candidates, the work of the Board could have been done more easily, conveniently and, need I add, efficiently. It is not my purpose to say that the Board is unnecessary and I do not say so. Without meaning any offence to anybody, I have to say that some of the Commissioners cannot justify their existence. With regard to Circars, so long as Mr. Surya Rao was there, the trouble was not keen. Now we have another gentleman, immediately follows a number of cases. They must know how

[Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo] * [26th March 1929]

to adjust themselves; they must know how to administer the religious endowments and to put them in order and must be able to chalk out a line for efficient management."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I am trying my best to understand how the remarks of the hon. Member are relevant to the motion under discussion."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"Because collection depends upon these facts."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member is requested to come to the question of collections very soon."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"I say it is therefore time that the selection of these Commissioners be left to the Public Services Commission. Sir, trustees have been appointed without due consideration of the needs of the temples or of the wishes of the people and the result is there has been chaos, chaos at present where there was at least an iota of order. To-day the Board comes 'forward and says we have no money; please help us'. I think we must return a blank cheque because you have not cared to manage your affairs. The Board was intended for higher purposes, and you have failed to fulfil your purpose and therefore bless yourselves."

"Even where paid trustees have been appointed, no rules of procedure have been framed. Only the Act is there; not even executive instructions are given. The Board has power to frame by-laws and the Government have power to frame rules. If Government had framed rules and laid down procedure, it would have led to efficient collection. In my district a number of temples and matams have been brought under the control of the Board and trustees have been appointed for these temples and matams. The result is that the management is worse than what the matadhipathis were doing. For the last $1\frac{1}{2}$ years it is going from bad to worse since Mr. Surya Rao handed over charge. To quote instances, we have the Kullada temples as also the Haradakhandy Math. A trustee has been appointed on Rs. 300 for the Haradakhandy Math besides a costly establishment which gets an income of Rs. 1,40,000. They have no idea as to where the money is to be kept in custody. Why not keep the amount in some bank or in the Post office? Otherwise it will lead to immense mischief. Rules must be framed or executive instructions should be given as to the custody of these moneys, and also for proper leasing out of the properties. The Religious Endowments Board say now that we have not realised any money; the only reply we can give is 'bless yourself'. I was told that the Board asked for a sum of Rs. 50,000. I do not find any reason why the Government should give them only Rs. 24,000 when they really want Rs. 50,000. If you are convinced of the real necessities that the Board require Rs. 50,000, by all means give them that amount. Let them have their existence. Give them necessary funds and let them have a chance to justify our expectations under the able guidance of Mr. Reddi who was for a long time our colleague here. I was told that about sixty appeals were pending before the High Court. If the Government come to the conclusion after examination that the Board have to get some money and if the payment of the sum of Rs. 50,000 will put them in the way to repay not only this amount but also the sum of Rs. $2\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs already borrowed, by all means the Government should pay them a sum of Rs. 50,000. Want of money paralyses the activities of any institution. The Board often fails to pay the Commissioners and sometimes the unfortunate clerks."

26th March 1929] * [Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo]

" Temple committees are agents of the Board under the Act, and they can be relied upon for efficient collection work. The constitution of these temple committees has been far from satisfactory. That is one reason why we are unwilling to give the power of nomination to the Government. I know from my experience of my district—and I have heard from several hon. Members of various parties stating that the nominations are not properly made and hence work suffers. . . ."

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR :—" Is the hon. Member in order, Sir."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" I do not yield to the hon. Member."

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR :—" May I know if the hon. Member is in order to talk about nominations when he is speaking about collections ?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member tries to show that, by good nominations, collection work will be quite all right. (Laughter.)"

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" I explained myself. I hold, Sir, that I confined myself within the four corners of your ruling. . . ."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member is a new Member of the Council."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" Sir, we wanted that these committees should have long existence so as to enable them to evolve some policy. If the hands are changed year after year, collection work must necessarily suffer. When the hon. Minister's predecessor came forward with a Bill to extend the lifetime of these committees by two years, we refused and he accepted it to have them only for one year. That is clear from page 295 of the Proceedings, dated 2nd November 1927. These committees are still there. If any temple trustee takes it into his head that the existence of these committees is illegal, I think there will be far more litigation than what we have now. If the hon. Minister does not make up his mind and come forward with an amending Bill, the temple committees and the Board will revert to the state of things in 1926."

* Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI :—" Mr. President, Sir, however irrelevant some of the remarks of my hon. Friends on this side of the House 1 p.m. might be . . ."

Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" May I rise to a point of order. Is the judgment of irrelevancy in the President or in the Members, Sir ?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member has not submitted it to the ruling of the Council. He is only expressing his view of the question."

* Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI :—" I wish to make a few observations with a view to clearing a misapprehension on the part of certain hon. Members of this House. They have been telling us that collection work has been very bad. Though I am not directly connected with the collection work of this Board, I may point out that I have some knowledge of the working of these things, having been a member of the temple committee in my district. Now that the Act has been passed and given effect to, there seems to be a good deal of difficulty in convincing the trustees or owners of temples to pay off their own quota as early as possible. In certain cases, the matter had to

[Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi]

[26th March 1929]

be taken to Court and the decisions of the Court were awaited, and even if the decision of the Court was given, the decree had to be executed and all these processes mean delay in the realization of the money. I do think that similar difficulties are felt in the Religious Endowments Board also. I have been told that all attempts are being made to realize the money as early as possible. Further for want of money they have not been able to appoint an efficient staff to collect the amounts due from the excepted temples. You know there were several cases and petitions in the High Court objecting to the very Hindu Religious Endowments Act and in a couple of years all these obstructionist methods were got over and regular work was begun. After having begun that work, during the last two years, the progress that has been made seems to be very satisfactory, but if they are running short of funds, it must be said to the discredit of the temple managers or trustees who have not been ready to pay their contributions. Further, it has to be observed that the staff is very inadequate and a district inspector or two will not be sufficient to collect all the funds that are due to the Board. The very same difficulties are being felt in the mufassal also in regard to temple committees. There are certain temples which are 'non-excepted' and which have to pay their quota both to the Board and to the temple committee of the district. They feel really that it is a burdensome task to be paying their contributions to both of them. In these circumstances, I feel that there is nothing to show that the Religious Endowments Board is not at all negligent about their duties and that they have been trying their best to collect the funds due to them. And, in course of time, I think, they will be able to maintain their office by their own funds. If we pass this demand it will be only passing a loan of Rs. 24,000 to the Board, which the Board may be able to repay in the course of a few years to repay and as such there will be no difficulty in passing this grant. The remarks of the hon. Members, that it is not at all necessary to make any such grant or that the Board has not been doing its work properly do not at all stand any argument and they are not also based upon facts."

* The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—" Mr. President, I am very much indebted to the previous speaker who has replied most effectively to the points raised by hon. Friends opposite. I think your contention was that the carrying of the token cut will really mean that the total amount wanted could not be spent and only Rs. 99 will be voted as this motion is moved under the proviso to sub-rule (1) of rule 32 which runs as follows :

' Provided that when funds to meet proposed expenditure on a new service can be made available by re-appropriation a demand for the grant of a token sum may be submitted to the vote of the Council and if the Council assents to the demand, funds may be so made available '.

" So if the Council accepts the motion of Mr. Swami Nayudu and cuts out Re. 1 out of this token demand, the amount that the Government will have to spend will be only Rs. 99 and not the amount provided for, namely, Rs. 24,000. So, the carrying out of the token cut will really mean the total rejection of the demand. That is my contention, Mr. President.

" As to the difficulties that the Board is working under, it has been pointed out ably by Mr. Ramachandra Reddi. The only way that the Board can collect funds is under section 70 of the Act, which provides that a demand should first be issued and if there is a failure to pay then it can only be recovered by recourse to litigation. Hon. Members, I believe, are aware that coercive litigation takes time and the Board are

26th March 1929]

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

doing their best to recover the money. As Mr. Swami Nayudu read out from the Administration Reports of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board, the Board has been trying its best to get all the money realized and with all the best intentions in the world it has not succeeded in doing this. I think if they manage to do better, I am sure they will be able to repay this amount of Rs 24,000. I am not talking of the old loan at all. No decision has been come to with regard to that. Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the Council will carry this demand."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I now put the motion of Mr. Swami Nayudu to the vote of the House. The question is 'to reduce the allotment of Rs. 100 by Re 1'."

The motion was put to the House and lost.

* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO — 'Mr. President, I rise to oppose the grant. This is an unfortunate department which is being administered without being recognized as a department. It is an unfortunate law that is attempted to be administered and it is a more unfortunate Minister who has the charge of this particular subject. I am afraid, Sir, that we cannot accede to making this provision of giving a loan to the Religious Endowments Board without knowing exactly where we stand. It is not a mere question of debtor and a creditor. The Government have certain specific duties to perform in regard to the Religious Endowments Board. If the Endowments Board were a corporation by itself, independent in its own powers of administration, Government may be right in treating this question as a question of debtor and creditor. As a matter of fact, the hon. Minister for Self-Government is also in charge of this portfolio and he has the thumb over the Religious Endowments Board. We have heard from the speech made by my hon. Friend from Godavari and also from the hon. the Chief Minister himself that the Religious Endowments Board has a great many difficulties to contend against. I feel that it has very many difficulties to contend against and the gravest difficulty is the hon. Minister himself. The reason is obvious. The question of considering the relationship between the Religious Endowments Board, the Act under which it works and the Government which administer this particular subject, has been before the country for a very long time . . ."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. The hon. Member is launching on a very big subject as to the relationship of the Minister to the Religious Endowments Board. I may tell him he is not at all in order. The only question he will be allowed to discuss is whether the Government will stand in the position of creditor and allow the Religious Endowments Board to continue as its debtor."

* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO:—"I want, Sir, that the Government should not allow the Religious Endowments Board to continue any longer as debtor. If the Government has courage in itself let it undertake the whole burden and carry it on as a department of its own. Let it not give the Board a bad name and bang it. If the Government endorses the view that the Board should be permitted to draw loans from the Government what really happens is that the Board gets all the blame and the hon. Minister all the praise. That is what is being done in the name of the Board. The Commissioners of the Board are poor people—they are not poor in the matter of pay, but they are poor in regard to their powers—and are put to very great difficulties in the matter of collection, and they are asked to carry on

[Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao.] '26th March 1929
the administration. If what the hon. Member from Ganjam has stated is true, the Minister cuts off even the loan which this Board wants for its own purposes and here is a spectacle of a corporation carrying on business under the direction of a Minister and begging loans. I do not understand the real import of a loan being granted to the Endowments Board. If the Government takes it into its head to take up the administration of the whole department itself, let them do so and come before us for money to spend on that department and then there would be efficiency there. If the Government on the other hand think that the Endowments Board should shift for itself, let them say so, and allow the Board to cancel or to annul itself. There is no good playing hide-and-seek in this matter and let us have a clear statement from the Government as to its intentions. It is no good telling us that the Religious Endowments Board will be able, after six months, to pay this amount of Rs. 24,000 with interest or free of interest. What is the interest that the Government is going to charge on this loan?"

The hon. Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—"5 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent."

* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—"Yes, 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. But, why should a corporation that carries on the business of the Government for the better administration of the country be charged with such an interest as that, I do not understand at all, except it be that the hon. Minister wants to be safe without being disturbed with regard to the details of administration. I do not know if the theory has been started as in the excise policy. I do not know whether the hon. Minister will ere long start the theory that it is a corporation independently working and that this House has no control and that he cannot answer any questions or interpellations that we may ask. Unless Government makes up its mind to act clearly and definitely, I do not see any reason for them to come before this House with this token cut. A token cut is a dangerous matter. It makes the Corporation's position humiliating. The hon. Minister has to-day chosen to give them a loan of Rs. 24,000, he wants us to concede to the principle of giving a loan and to grant this token cut. I do not know whether there is anything that will prevent the Minister from giving more or less or bargaining with the Religious Endowments Board, with regard to the details of the loan, details of the interest and for using the Board in a manner not very conducive to the interests of the country. I do not want that the Board should be a beggar at the door of the Government or of the Minister. I therefore feel that this grant should not be made."

1-15 P.m. The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I take it the House is ready for a vote. The question is that Government be granted a further sum not exceeding Rs. 100 under Grant XXXVI—Loans and Advances by Provincial Government."

The motion was put and carried and the grant made.

IV

MADRAS SERVICES COMMISSION BILL—SITTINGS OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE AT OOTACAMUND.

Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—"Sir I beg to move—

'That this Council authorizes the Select Committee appointed by it to report on the Madras Services Commission Bill (Bill No. 5 of 1929) to hold its sittings at Ootacamund to consider the Bill and to draft the report'.

"The Select Committee is not likely to sit till after the 15th April. I therefore submit that the balance of convenience will certainly be in favour of

26th March 1929.] [Mr. S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar]

holding the sitting in Ootacamund. In connexion with the Brothels Bill, the House was influenced only by the consideration that as some ladies have to be examined the balance of convenience will be in holding the sitting at Madras. There is as yet no such thing here, because it is not proposed to examine any witnesses.

“Looked at from the pecuniary point of view, I may say the expenditure will be much less if the meeting is held at Ootacamund than in Madras. It so happens that most of the members of the select committee live nearer Ootacamund than Madras and so their travelling allowance will be smaller than that they will claim if the meeting is to take place in Madras. Further Members of Government will be at that time in Ootacamund and if the meeting is to be held at Madras they will have to travel to this place, and you know that they generally travel only in saloons. Therefore, viewed at from the point of view of convenience and expenditure the more advantageous course would be to hold the meeting in Madras (hear, hear and laughter), I mean at Ootacamund. I therefore move that this Council do vote for this.”

Mr. C. GOPALA MENON :—“I beg to second it.”

* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—“Mr. President, Sir, I rise to oppose this motion. My friend in putting the case referred to another motion which was opposed on the floor of this House and which was eventually withdrawn. The reasons are less urgent in this case. The Public Services Commission Bill is a Bill that may wait for a time, it having waited for such a length of time already. And my friend, while moving, was doubtful as to whether witnesses would be summoned before this committee or not. He said ‘as yet’ there is no proposal to call witnesses before this committee. ‘As yet’ indicates there may be proposals to examine witnesses. If that thing happens it is the same thing, it is identically the same thing as the other case except for the difference in the degree of emergency. I am not totally against doing business in the bills, so long as the Government go there. But I am opposed to this matter going to the bills. This is a question which can stand over for some time, and if Government do not come to a conclusion on this matter no violent departure from the ordinary would be made, though of course the whole country would be glad to have the matter disposed of as early as possible. There is nothing emergent about it, as in the matter of the Brothels Bill. Knowing all these facts, I should little expect my friend whom I credit with a little eye on the popular interest that he should have come forward with this motion. I hope he will withdraw it and I also hope that if he does not withdraw, this House will not vote for it.”

* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—“Sir, Government support this motion as they want to expedite this important measure. Further it is not calculated to cost more than, in fact it will be less costly than, meeting in Madras.”

Mr. F. E. JAMES :—“Sir, may I ask the hon. the Revenue Member one question? Is it the intention of Government to bring this Bill before this Council in its lifetime?”

* The hon. Sir NORMAN MARJORIBANKS :—“Yes, Sir; otherwise we would not be supporting this motion.”

[26th March 1929]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I take it the House is ready for a vote. The question is ‘ that this Council authorizes the select committee appointed by it to report on the Madras Services Commission Bill (Bill No. 5 of 1929) to hold its sittings at Ootacamund to consider the Bill and to draft the report.”

The motion was put and carried.

V

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE FOR 1926-27.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The Council will now take into consideration the Report ^a of the Public Accounts Committee.”

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya :—“ Sir, I am one of those who appended a dissenting minute to the report and I want to say something on this important subject. From the report you will see that there has been unfortunately a tendency to under-estimate the revenue and over-estimate the expenditure. The over-estimation of the revenue will be seen from a consideration of the estimates of revenue for the last number of years. I will refer hon. Members to the estimates for 1925-26 and 1927-28. I was able to pick it up here only; and I may add that what holds good for these two years holds good also for the other years. Thus in the estimates for the year 1925-26, hon. Members will see that while Government expect a revenue of 16½ crores, the amount actually realized shows sixteen crores and nineteen lakhs. Similarly for the year 1927-28 while the estimate was 16.54 crores the actual amount realized for the year as per account is 17.56 crores, i.e., over a crore. This shows that the revenues of the province have not been properly estimated. Not only the revenues have not been under-estimated but that the expenditure side has also been over-estimated. Besides that most of the departments to whom money was allotted have not spent the money but have allowed it to lapse and the lapsed amounts work up in lakhs. To quote some figures, in 1923-24, the lapsed money alone amounted to 88.3 lakhs. For 1924-25 the lapses amounted to 63 lakhs. For 1926-27 the lapses amounted to one crore and sixty-three lakhs. Such an estimate leads to the result of an irresponsible system of administration that could be thought of. Sir, the Accountant-General and the Auditor-General year after year have been warning Government about this sad state of budgeting as also to the control of expenditure; but these have never been attended to either by the Finance Department or by the heads of the departments concerned or by the controlling officers of the Government. Sir, I will take a little time of the House to invite the attention of hon. Members to the remarks of the Accountant-General and the Auditor-General for the year 1923-24. At page 22, the Auditor-General agrees and accepts the remarks of the Accountant-General in the following words: ‘ Even so, I endorse fully the remarks made by the Accountant-General, Madras, that the necessity for economy and curtailment of expenditure as well as for development of revenue still exists.’ Similar remarks occur at pages 56 and 11 in the reports for the years 1924-25 and 1926-27. These warnings of the Accountant-General and the Auditor-General time after time and year after year have not been heeded by the Government. Thus we have to deal with a budget where the expenditure as per accounts exceeds the estimates; and it exceeds the actual expenditure by 10 per cent. That is seen from the report

^a Vide proceedings of the 11th March 1929.

26th March 1929]* [Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo]

of the Public Accounts Committee for the year 1926-27. Then, Sir, under the Devolution Rules the heads of departments have got the power of transferring grants from one sub-head to another sub-head and the Finance Department has full power of transferring sums from one main head to another main head, as also of sanctioning transfers from one sub-head to another sub-head. Sir, this has led to a system of expenditure which is unjustifiable in many cases and which is most irresponsible in all cases of denial of executive responsibility to the legislature. Sir, under the Government of India Act as also under the Devolution Rules the Finance Department was specially created to look into this aspect of the question, i.e., to lay down a proper estimate of the revenues of the province as also a proper estimate of the expenditure before this House so as to enable hon. Members enforce responsibility on the executive, which alone will lead to real responsibility. I submit this expectation has not at all been fulfilled. Nor has the Finance Department justified its existence."

The hon. the PRESIDENT.—"The hon. Member will continue his speech after lunch. The Council will now adjourn for lunch and re-assemble."

After Lunch (2-30 p.m.).

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"May I know from the Leader of the Opposition how long he expects that this debate on the Public Accounts Committee report will continue?"

* Mr. P. C. VENKATAPATI RAJU:—"That depends entirely upon the speakers on the Treasury side, Mr. President. How can I say?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"There is one item, namely, Mr. Saldanha's Bill on the agenda. If the Opposition is anxious to have it finished, the only day available in this session is this. It is entirely left in their hands to adjust the programme, and if things are allowed to drift, I have no objection."

* Mr. P. C. VENKATAPATI RAJU:—"Mr. President, we are very anxious to reach Mr. Saldanha's Bill, which after all will not take more than half an hour or so. I was talking to the Leader of the House to see whether he would consent, if necessary, to sit for some time more. Of course, only if it is necessary, we will try to finish it before 5 p.m. We were considering this matter so that we might make a representation to you."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Both sides can agree about sitting after 5 o'clock or not, on seeing the progress made in the debate. In the meantime I want to know the intentions of the Opposition."

* Mr. P. C. VENKATAPATI RAJU:—"We do not want to unnecessarily prolong the discussion, Sir."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"Mr. President, Sir, I have already shown in my speech that the incomes have been under-estimated and the expenditures have been over-estimated. And this is even done year after year irrespective of and in spite of the warnings given by the Accountant-General and the Auditors, which are year after year also approved by the members of the Public Accounts Committee."

"Having done that, Sir, I come to the question of supplementary grants. Under rule 32 of the Legislative Council Rules the Government is authorized to come to this Council for supplementary grants if the whole sum under a particular grant has been exhausted. Unfortunately our Government

[Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo] [26th March 1929]

instead of waiting to exhaust the grant, or without even caring to see whether the departments for which the supplementary grants are asked for had really a capacity to spend the money—without considering any of these questions—they come to this House as a matter of course as if we are toys to nod consent to anything that has been brought forward on the floor of this House. Supplementary demands are brought forward and carried through in this Council, with the result that in many cases of supplementary grants, the money spent for the year granted to them is far less than the money granted to them in the original demand, not to speak of the supplementary amounts that are sought for. Sir, nothing can be more irresponsible than this, and I cannot do better than quoting the words of the Accountant-General given at page 25 of the Public Accounts Committee report for 1924-25. The following extract has been quoted and approved by the Public Accounts Committee from the remarks of the Accountant-General:—

‘ Constitutionally the proper spending of grants is of much greater significance than the individual financial irregularities which form the subject-matter of the audit report. With the institution of departmental accounts from the 1st April 1925 the responsibilities of officers in this important matter can be more justly brought home to them.’

“ Then, Sir, proceeding further it says :

‘ It must be remembered, however, that the Public Accounts Committee regards an unnecessary application for an additional grant as a sin only a little less heinous than that of exceeding a grant.’

“ I think, Sir, no condemnation could be more scathing than the extracts that I have read from the reports of competent expert opinion, criticising and condemning the action of the Government in respect of these supplementary grants. In my minute of dissent appended to the report of the Public Accounts Committee for 1926-27 I have shown also that though the Government came forward with a demand for grant for Rs 27·69 lakhs as a matter of course, the expenditure under Grants Nos. VII, XV, XX, XX to XXVII, XXX, XXXI and XXXVI has not even exceeded the original grants, not to speak of the supplementary demands. All these go to show the irresponsible way in which the Government have been coming forward with supplementary demands, and the injustice and careless way with which the hon. Members of this House are treated. Sir, having said so much about the supplementary demands, I come to the very important question of the growth of revenue and the growth of expenditure in this province. Both the Accountant-General and the Auditor-General have severely criticised the question of the respective growth of revenue and the growth of expenditure in this Presidency. Sir, looking into the financial memoranda that are submitted to us year after year by the hon. the Finance Member, hon. Members will see the increase of revenue from 1921 to 1922 as also from 1926 to 1927. The ordinary growth of revenue in this province has been 149·99, i.e., in round figures $1\frac{1}{2}$ crores of rupees ; while the growth up to 1929 to 1930 are given at 169·87. The normal income of this province thus has been about $1\frac{1}{2}$ crores, the normal increase in the expenditure in the case of these six years, that is, up to 1926-27—I take only these reformed years—under these items has been 297·99, i.e., 298 lakhs of rupees ; this approaches practically three crores of rupees. So hon. Members will please see that the normal growth of expenditure has been practically double that of the normal growth of income in this province. Having known this, they will now please see the significance of the note submitted by the hon. the Finance Member to the Committee that was appointed to go into the supplementary demands in 1927.

26th March 1929] . [Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo]

"The hon. the Finance Member then said that in case this province gets the full remission of the provincial contribution, it will just be enough for three years to meet the normal expenditures of this province. I think after one or two years hon. Members will see to their grief that he will balance the income and expenditure of this province, with the result that there will not be a single pie left for the nation-building departments, either for any programme of expanding primary education or prohibition or for anything of lasting value, to the country."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I think the hon. Member is getting into the province of the general debate on the budget. This is only an opportunity to criticise whether amounts sanctioned by the Council for particular purposes have been spent by the Government for those purposes or not. I do recognize, however, that the report of the Public Accounts Committee is not confined to this point only. Rule 34 (1) says: 'It shall be the duty of the Committee to satisfy itself that the money voted by the Council has been spent within the scope of the demand granted by the Council.' That is the duty of the Public Accounts Committee. Again rule 34 (2) says: 'It shall be the duty of the Committee to bring to the notice of the Council (i) every reappropriation from one grant to another grant; (ii) every reappropriation within a grant which is not made in accordance with the rules, etc., and (iii) all expenditure which the Finance Department has requested should be brought to the notice of the Council.' So far as can be seen the Finance Department has not requested the Committee to bring any expenditure to the notice of the Council. In this connexion, it may be noted that under rule 33 (1) the Public Accounts Committee may deal with the audit and appropriation accounts 'and such other matters as the Finance Department may refer to the Committee.' Thus, matters of finance other than the audit and appropriation accounts may be referred by the department to the Committee. If the procedure laid down in the rules had been strictly followed, it would have been easy for me to control the debate. As a matter of fact, the whole Appropriation Report is placed before the Committee and the Committee passes a resolution on every paragraph of the report; and all the decisions of the Committee are placed before the House without any references to the points mentioned in rule 34 (2), as the points which the Committee is bound to bring to the notice of the Council. If the Finance Department had specified the matters which it wanted to be examined by the Public Accounts Committee and if out of those points those alone had been placed before the Council which are required by rule 34 (2) to be placed before the Council, the procedure would have been more appropriate. I shall not now be justified in restricting the scope of the debate, because the whole of the appropriation accounts are placed before the Public Accounts Committee without any regard to the scope of the Committee's functions. That Committee went into them and the whole Report of the Committee is placed before the Council by the Finance Member who has not specified which particular matters the Committee wanted to bring to the notice of the Council. I do see the difficulty but at the same time I request hon. Members to do their best to be within the strict scope of the three paragraphs referred to in rule 34, for this year."

* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—"May I submit that there is no indication as stated by you, Sir, as to what is to be done? In such a case, how can we confine ourselves within the scope of these restrictions?"

[26th March 1929]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I do not put it as a ruling, but I only put it as a recommendation to get into the right lines, if I may say so."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" I will close that part of my argument. I would not have said a word about it if the Public Accounts Committee had not made certain observations on the recommendations of the Accountant-General and if the Government had not gone so far as to justify their position as against the suggestions offered by the Accountant-General and the Auditor-General. I want to say, and I do hold, that the position taken up by Government as also by the majority of members of the Public Accounts Committee is not tenable and the position taken up by the Accountant-General and the Auditor-General is right; and, as such, the House ought to be given an unambiguous decision in this matter. That is the view which I wanted to place before the hon. Members of this House.

" Sir, I have now practically done. I think the time has come, in view of these things, that we should have a retrenchment committee which would go into the whole question of expenditure and suggest ways and means to keep the expenditure on a satisfactory level.

" Then, the Finance Committee has got very important functions under the Reformed Government."

The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR :—" On a point of order. Are we discussing the Finance Committee?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" If in this discussion anything is referred to in this Public Accounts Committee Report with regard to the working of the Finance Committee, it will be in order. I have only to see whether there is any reference to the working of the Finance Committee in this Report."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" I have very much to say about the Finance Committee, but I shall take your recommendation to be brief and act up to it. The Finance Committee is vested with the power of scrutinizing those estimates which have been charged with over-estimating the expenditure. Unfortunately in this province, we do not have a committee to help the Finance Member in scrutinizing the budget estimates submitted by the heads of departments, though the Montford Report has laid down specific recommendations on this point. In other provinces, to my knowledge, Bihar and Orissa and Bengal, have got committees to scrutinize the estimates submitted by the heads of departments, with the result that there are less chances for over-estimation of expenditure and the executive is forced into doing things in a more responsible way. That being so, there is a clear case for the appointment of a retrenchment committee and a budget committee, as has been done in some provinces and also as has been recommended by the illustrious authors of the Montford Report, to help the Finance Member in the discharge of his very responsible and useful functions which have not been duly attended.

" Then I come to the Industries policy. I would not dilate much on it, but I have to refer to the Leather Trade Institute which has been referred to both in my minute of dissent and in the minute of my hon. Friend, Mr. Narayana Raju, who took a lot of pains to study the question. This Government unfortunately—I do not know why—is too much wedded to the Leather Trade Institute, which was condemned consecutively by the Public

26th March 1929] . [Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo]

Accounts Committees of last year and also of this year. The Accountant-General has also raised serious objection to this item of expenditure as unnecessary and wasteful. The Auditor-General has also accepted the view of the Accountant-General. But this unfortunate Government, with our Friend the hon. Minister for Industries, wanted to perpetuate this branch. In his anxiety to extend its life, he made a reference to the Government of India and also of the provinces just to convert this useless branch into a very useful one. They said they would not have anything to do with it, nor would they contribute a pie towards its maintenance. At a certain stage of the Public Accounts Committee we were told that they were going to effect a great many retrenchments which would make us accept their proposal, and when called to place the papers showing the savings proposed, to our great surprise we were told that a few posts of peons and workers, those who were really useful, were abolished, and the top-heavy officers, i.e., the expert and his assistants were kept on. I hold that it is an unnecessary and extravagant expenditure, and if it had been placed before the Public Accounts Committee they would have given an unqualified verdict in favour of its closure. But for a ruling of the Chairman who held that it had already been decided when there was none the question was not placed before the Public Accounts Committee, I must in fairness to my hon. Friend say here that while we were talking about the minutes of dissent to be appended by my hon. Friend Mr. Raju and myself we were told that this was decided."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" May I rise to a point of order. This discussion on the policy of closing the Leather Trade Institute is outside the scope of the motion to consider the report of the Public Accounts Committee."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" He is not talking about it at all."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" The discussion of the policy of closing the Leather Trade Institute does not come within the purview of this motion."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" As I understand, the facts are these. The Accountant-General recommended the closing of the institute this year or previous year, but it was not closed. The matter was placed before the Public Accounts Committee and the Committee came to the decision that the institute shall be continued for one year. Mr. Narayana Raju and Mr. Biswanath Das have written dissenting minutes that the recommendations of the Accountant-General should have been given effect to. An amendment is now tabled by Mr. Narayana Raju that the recommendation should be given effect to. Is the hon. Member aware of the amendment which Mr. Narayana Raju has tabled ? (Laughter)."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Neither the Accountant-General nor the Public Accounts Committee have anything to do with the policy of Government, and the Accountant-General has no business to recommend the closing of this institution."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The Government ought to have consulted Mr. Saldanha (laughter) before they placed the opinion of the Accountant-General before the Public Accounts Committee. When once the matter is placed by the Government in the hands of the Public Accounts Committee, a committee of this House, the House will have the right to revise that opinion."

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS MAHASAYO :—" I thank you, Sir. If there is 3 p.m. any delay, I think, hon. Members will have to blame themselves more than

[Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo] [26th March 1929]

myself for their interruptions. Sir, now I have done. I think that the policy pursued by this Government in presenting estimates of revenue and expenditure has been faulty. They have not been treating the Council and its Members properly in the matter of supplementary grants for which they come time and again for sanction and also that the growth of expenditure over the growth of revenue has been horrible and the industrial policy of the Government is wasteful.

“With these remarks, Sir, I close my speech.”

* Mr. C. GOPALA MENON :—“Mr. President, Sir, I will not take up more than a minute or two of the time of this House. I am only going to say a few words in addition to what I have already said yesterday. With regard to the Leather Trade Institute, I do not agree with the views of Mr. Biswanath Das and Mr. Narayana Raju, who are Members of the Public Accounts Committee and my colleagues in that committee, and also with the views of the Accountant-General. Sir, as hon. Members are aware that there is an export duty of 5 per cent upon hides and skins. It was formerly 15 per cent. But by a resolution passed at the World Economic Conference in Geneva pressure is being brought to bear upon the Government of India for the abolition of the duty, and if according to that resolution this duty is removed and the Government of India levies a cess which is, what is in view, instead of an export duty to assess the value of leather exported from this country. Until that is definitely known, I urge upon the hon. Members of this House for the retention of this Leather Trade School. I would rather have it named Leather Research Institute for the purpose.

“I entirely endorse the views of my colleagues that the expenditure by the Institute should be curtailed because we are losing very heavily, pointing out at the same time that it has got a purpose for which it was created, and I should like to urge upon the Members that this thing must be kept prominently in view.

“I have only one word more to add. As regards the view of the Accountant-General that the growth of expenditure of the province has not been proportionate with the growth of revenue, we know the reason for it. The financial period of the last ten years since the Reforms may be divided into two periods—one with the period of the imposition of the Provincial contributions and the other with the period when remissions began to come in. With the introduction of the Reforms the province had to incur expenditure of various kinds, which is only necessary and inevitable. In addition to that we had to contribute 348 lakhs as provincial contribution under the Meston Award. It was a third of what we collected then as revenue from the people and this sum had to be paid to the Central Government. In fact, we actually contributed a sum as big as the contributions of all the other provinces put together excepting probably Punjab. But when the remissions began to come in, the various departments had not paid proper attention to economise their expenditure. In fact, the various departments over-estimated their expenditure with the result that it resulted in great deal of surrenders. This thing has to be avoided in the future. My hon. Friend Mr. Biswanath Das proposed that a Retrenchment Committee should go into the financial position of the presidency. But the hon. the Finance Member in his budget speech has clearly warned the various departments that the present scale of expenditure cannot go on any longer as there is no room for

26th March 1929]

[Mr. C. Gopala Menon]

the expansion of revenues of the province. But, however, the time has already reached, in my view, to take a detailed survey of the present financial position of the Province. The increase in normal expenditure must be cut down to balance the normal revenue and that is essentially a condition of a well-ordered progress in the future. We must correctly estimate our annual expenditure for the next few years on our present commitments and both on recurring and non-recurring schemes and find means for utilizing the present revenue and if there is a surplus it must be kept aside for any unforeseen circumstances. Until some such thing is done the growth of expenditure is bound to go up."

* The hon. Mr. T. E. MOIR: "Mr. President, I propose, Sir, in the first place, to deal with the motion of the Hon. Member for West Godavari, in which he invites the House to express its disagreement with the conclusions of the Public Accounts Committee on four specific points. There is, of course, no objection to such a motion being brought under discussion although I regret the actual form which the motion has taken, namely, an indication to the House to accept the views of the Accountant-General in preference to those of the Statutory Commission. Now, Sir, that invitation seems to me to be based on an incorrect appreciation of the position. In considering this report of the Statutory Committee, the Legislative Council is not arbitrating or pronouncing judgment as between the Accountant-General and the Committee. Where differences of opinion arise between the Accountant-General and a department of Government on matters within the purview of the Public Accounts Committee, it is to the Public Accounts Committee that they are referred. The Committee hears both sides and comes to its decision which is incorporated in the report which is laid before the House. It is, I may say, to the wording of the motion that I object, as it seems to me to treat the Accountant-General and the Public Accounts Committee, a Statutory Committee of this House, as equal or parallel authorities. That is not the position and I feel sure that the Accountant-General himself would be the first to deprecate any misconception as regards his relations to and position with reference to the Statutory Committee before which his report is placed. I would suggest, Sir, that future motions of this kind might be so worded as to avoid any room for misconception on this point. It is, of course, a matter of considerable importance that the Legislative Council should not lightly differ from the decision arrived at by its own Statutory Committee of this kind, and I will now venture to deal with the specific points raised in the motion before the House. As regards the first point, what the Accountant-General actually said was 'it might be advisable at this stage for Government to take a review of the results of the departmental manner of exploiting the timber resources of the Presidency.' That, Sir, was with reference to the accounts for 1926-27. Since then, Government have undertaken a comprehensive review of the organization and the working of the Forest department. Such a review must, of course, cover all departmental working, and it is not unreasonable that the Committee should accept a statement to that effect as fully covering the tentative suggestion made by the Accountant-General in the report on the Appropriation Accounts.

"Turning now to the second point, as regards the position of certain officers under judicial training as non-vacation officers, the position is simply this: Certain officers are placed under judicial training for a period

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

[26th March 1929]

which covers 18 months. That training is controlled and prescribed by the High Court. It includes both study and practical training. For practical training these officers are attached to different Courts where they sit with the presiding Judge and also try cases assigned to them ; but the object, of course, is not to give relief to the Courts but to train them for their future duties. As the period of 18 months must necessarily cover the vacation period of any Court, they are expected to devote that period to the study of law on such lines and in such place as the controlling authority may direct. Their position, therefore, is entirely different from that of the Judge of a Court who is permitted to avail himself of the vacation provided arrangements are made for attending to the routine duties. The view that the training is continuous and that its continuity is not affected by the closure of the Courts for the vacation was accepted after full consideration by the majority of the Committee and from that conclusion the treatment of these officers as non-vacation officers naturally follows.

“The next point to which the motion under discussion refers is with regard to the constitution of the Mettur district. Large works, such as the Cauvery-Mettur project, must necessarily involve general administrative arrangements. These may vary from time to time according to the needs of the moment as has been the case with Mettur. The Committee accepted the view that such administrative arrangements were necessary for the functioning of the project and implicit in its conception, and that it was, therefore, unreasonable to treat the necessary administrative arrangements as distinct from and constituting a separate new service outside the scope of the project and the sanction. If I may illustrate that standpoint by one example, a considerable amount of expenditure on a project of this kind is concerned with the acquisition of the land required. The acquisition of land requires the employment of staff and the staff requires necessary supervision.

“As regards the last point, namely, the Leather Trade Institute, I would first say that the hon. Member is incorrect in stating that the Accountant-General recommended that the Leather Trade Institute should be closed. The Accountant-General's remarks are contained in paragraph 10 on pages 153 and 154 of his report and they contain no such recommendation. In fact, as has been pointed out by one hon. Member, it is not the function of the Accountant-General to make recommendations on purely administrative issues of this kind. It was the Public Accounts Committee of the previous year that recommended that the institute should be closed as soon as possible.

3-15
p.m.

“One hon. Member has raised the question as to whether the Public Accounts Committee itself was within its powers in making a recommendation on an administrative issue of that kind. My recollection is indeed that at the time of the discussion in that year a tentative suggestion was made that in making such a recommendation the Committee was somewhat exceeding the powers and the functions entrusted to it. However, paragraph 42 of the report which is now under discussion clearly states the position as it was placed before the Public Accounts Committee of the current year. The future position and functions of the institute are of course administrative matters within the control of my hon. Colleague the Minister for Development. And I may add that this very question was discussed in connexion with the budget yesterday. The question of the continuance of the institute was raised directly in connexion with the budget and my hon. Colleague gave his explanation as to the action which he

26th March 1929]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

intended to take in reference to its continuance. I understand that he informed the House that before taking any further action he desires to consult the leaders of the trade and others directly interested in the question. The grant with reference to which a cut motion was moved on that issue was rejected by the House and the demand was passed and so I think it would be out of order on my part if I were to consider that issue as being to-day open to my comments whether of dissent or approval.

"As regards the more general points which have been raised, I do not propose to refer in detail to the remarks of the hon. Member from South Kanara. His general complaint was his inability to understand the report. That, of course, I regret, but, as he himself confessed that he had thrown aside his copy of the report of the Accountant-General on which the report of the Public Accounts Committee is based, I am afraid that he must take the responsibility for that upon himself.

"Nor do I propose to follow the hon. Member for the University in those points in which he crossed the t's and dotted the i's of the observations and recommendations made by the Public Accounts Committee. The extent to which he did so and, I think, other hon. Members also, is in itself sufficient evidence of the value of the Committee's labours. I shall confine myself therefore to one or two specific points. The hon. Member referred to the form in which the budget estimates are presented and stated that that is vested in the sole authority of the Finance Member. I think the hon. Member seems to be under some misapprehension. The form in which the budget estimates and the subsidiary accounts are presented to the Legislative Council depends upon the form of the accounts and the form of the accounts is prescribed in all major matters by the Auditor-General. The hon. Member was, I think, referring to Legislative Council Rule 26 (1) which deals with the framing of the Schedule of Demands. That is an entirely distinct matter from the form of the Civil Budget Estimates or the powers which he attributed to the Public Accounts Committee in England. So far as I know, the position is that in England no alteration can be made in the form of the estimates without the consent of the Public Accounts Committee; but, the manner in which the budget shall be presented, the time and order in which the various demands shall be taken up for consideration are matters entirely within the power and control of the Government for the time being.

"The hon. Member also referred and with approval to lump sum cuts and quoted the example of the Government of India's procedure in that respect. On that I shall merely say that I have always opposed lump sum cuts for the reason that lump sum cuts simply result in lump sum grants. Hon. Members know the grave and serious objections to lump sum grants. I hold further that they merely encourage officers to budget loosely and to over-estimate in order to leave a greater margin against any anticipated lump sum cut. What we are doing here is to insist on more adequate budgeting with reference to past actuals and more carefully scrutinized anticipations.

"The hon. Member for the University also referred to item 34 on page 64 of the report. For the further information for which he asked, I would refer him to pages 120—121 of the report of the Public Accounts Committee for the previous year 1925-26. He also referred to the position of the Finance Committee. I have been unable to find the reference which

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

[26th March 1929]

he apparently had in mind. I have again studied the report with reference to his remarks on the point and those of the hon. Member for Ganjam, and have been unable to find in the Public Accounts Committee's Report a reference to the Finance Committee. I do not know therefore exactly what he meant by the phrase 'some kind of preliminary control over the original or supplementary demands.' The Auditor-General's conception of the functions of the Finance Committee is given on page 68 of the report. 'Such a Committee,' he says, 'should afford to the Local Government a valuable means of taking the views of a body representative of the Legislative Council upon projected expenditure before it is sanctioned.' That is exactly the function which the Finance Committee in this Province performs.

"The hon. Member also referred to non-voted expenditure and its determination. As to that, I can only point out that under the section of the Government of India Act to which he referred, viz., 72-D, should a question arise as to whether any particular item of expenditure should be treated as voted or non-voted, a final decision on the point is duly provided for. The hon. Member, therefore, seems to me to have been in error in suggesting that there is no provision of law governing such questions should they arise.

"The hon. Member from Ganjam, Mr. Biswanath Das, also devoted most of his time on his attempt to express his concurrence with the recommendations and remarks of the Public Accounts Committee. He referred to one or two specific points such as overestimating and bad budgeting. Only recently in my budget speech I dwelt on these questions exhaustively and made my own comments upon them. I do not therefore propose to weary the House by repeating them. He also referred to the increase of revenue and expenditure. This of course is not a matter with which the Public Accounts Committee is concerned. Its concern is to see that whatever expenditure that does take place has been incurred under proper sanction and with due regard to the statutory rules with reference to which it is constituted. But he went on, apparently not being satisfied with the existence of a Public Accounts Committee and of a Finance Committee to suggest that we should also have a retrenchment committee. I may say, Sir, that, as far as I am concerned, I have never yet failed to find such guidance or assistance as I require from the Finance Committee and the Public Accounts Committee in their respective spheres. I have no reason to suppose that their assistance would be denied to me in the future and therefore, as far as I am concerned, I do not propose to follow up the suggestion of the hon. Member who wanted another committee should be constituted to take over in whole or in part the functions which they, to my mind, discharge adequately.

"With these words I beg to oppose the motion of the hon. Member from West Godavari."

Mr. P. T. RAJAN :—"Sir, I move that the question be put."

The closure motion was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :—

Ayes.

1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks.	4. The hon. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan
2. " Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad	Nayar.
Usman Sahib Bahadur.	5. " Mr. M. R. Seturam Ayyar.
3. " Mr. T. E. Moir.	6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.

26th March 1929]

Ayes—cont.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 7. The hon. Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 39. The Zamindar of Kallikota. |
| 8. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai. | 40. Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. |
| 9. Mr. H. A. Watson. | 41. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam. |
| 10. „ C. A. Souter. | 42. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 11. „ S. H. Slater. | 43. The Zamindar of Seithur. |
| 12. „ A. McG. C. Tampoe. | 44. The Zamindar of Gollapalli. |
| 13. „ C. W. E. Cotton. | 45. Mr. V. Ramjee Rao. |
| 14. „ V. Ch. John. | 46. „ R. Nagan Gowda. |
| 15. „ M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. | 47. „ C. Gopala Menon. |
| 16. „ Syed Tajudin Sahib. | 48. „ B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 17. Munshi Abdul Wahab Sahib. | 49. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabapathi Mudaliyar. |
| 18. Mr. A. B. Shetty. | 50. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 19. „ J. Bheemayya. | 51. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayadu. |
| 20. „ R. Foulkes. | 52. Mr. P. T. Rajan. |
| 21. „ Mahmud Sehamnad Sahib. | 53. „ T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar. |
| 22. „ J. Kuppuswami. | 54. Rao Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar. |
| 23. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. | 55. Khan Bahadur Abdul Razack Sahib Bahadur. |
| 24. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. | 56. Mr. Muhammed Khadir Mohidin Sahib. |
| 25. „ K. Krishnan. | 57. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. |
| 26. „ Hilton Brown. | 58. Khan Sahib T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur. |
| 27. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. | 59. Rao Bahadur K. Sitarama Reddi. |
| 28. Mr. V. I. Munuswami Pillai. | 60. „ B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 29. „ W. P. A. Soundara Pandia Nadar. | 61. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. |
| 30. „ Daniel Thomas. | 62. The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri. |
| 31. „ S. Venkiah. | 63. Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao. |
| 32. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. | 64. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram. |
| 33. Mr. W. O. Wright. | |
| 34. „ F. E. James. | |
| 35. „ R. J. C. Robertson. | |
| 36. „ H. F. P. Hearson. | |
| 37. „ S. N. Dorai Raja. | |
| 38. „ S. Arpudaswami Udayar. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. P. C. Venkatapati Raju. | 12. Mr. K. R. Karant. |
| 2. „ K. Koti Reddi. | 13. „ P. Anjaneyulu. |
| 3. „ R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 14. „ C. Obi Reddi. |
| 4. „ Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 15. „ A. Parasurama Rao. |
| 5. „ S. Satyamurti. | 16. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 6. „ J. A. Saldanha. | 17. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 7. „ G. Harisarvottama Rao. | 18. „ K. Uppi Sahib. |
| 8. „ C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 19. „ O. Marudavaram Pillai. |
| 9. „ Abdal Hameed Khan. | 20. „ K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 10. Mr. K. V. R. Swami. | 21. „ G. Venkatarangam Nayudu. |
| 11. „ D. Narayana Raju. | 22. „ K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar. |

Ayes 64. Noes 22.

The closure motion was carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is to add the following at 3-30 p.m. the end:—

(a) That on such consideration this Council is of opinion that in regard to the following matters, namely,

- (1) Paragraph 27 of the Report—Separate review of the results of the departmental manner of exploiting the timber resources of the Presidency,
- (2) Paragraph 31 of the Report—Classification of Indian Civil Service officers under judicial training as non-vacation officers, and

[The President]

[26th March 1929]

(3) *Paragraph 48 of the Report—Failure to treat the formation of the Mettur district as a new service, the views of the Accountant-General should be accepted.*

‘(b) *And that in regard to paragraph 42 of the report this Council agrees with the recommendation of the Accountant-General that the Leather Trades Institute should be closed.*’

The motion was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. P. C. Venkatapati Raju. | 11. Mr. P. Anjaneyulu. |
| 2. „ K. Koti Reddi. | 12. „ C. Obi Reddi. |
| 3. „ R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 13. „ A. Parasurama Rao. |
| 4. „ S. Satyamurti. | 14. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 5. „ G. Harisarvottam Rao. | 15. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 6. „ C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 16. „ K. Uppi Sahib. |
| 7. „ Abdul Hameed Khan. | 17. „ C. Marudavanam Pillai. |
| 8. „ K. V. R. Swami. | 18. „ K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 9. „ D. Narayana Raju. | 19. „ C. Venkatarangam Nayudu. |
| 10. „ K. R. Karant. | 20. „ K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar. |

Noes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks. | 32. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |
| 2. „ Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 33. Mr. W. O. Wright. |
| 3. „ Mr. T. E. Moir. | 34. „ F. E. James. |
| 4. „ Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 35. „ R. J. C. Robertson. |
| 5. „ Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 36. „ H. F. P. Hearson. |
| 6. „ S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. | 37. „ S. N. Dorai Raja. |
| 7. „ Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 38. „ S. Arpudadaswami Udayar. |
| 8. Mr. Hilton Brown. | 39. The Zamindar of Kallikota. |
| 9. Diwan Bahadur P. Kesava Pillai | 40. Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. |
| 10. Mr. H. A. Watson. | 41. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam. |
| 11. „ C. A. Souter. | 42. Mr. V. Ramjee Rao. |
| 12. „ S. H. Slater. | 43. „ C. Gopala Menon. |
| 13. „ A. McG. C. Tampoe. | 44. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabapathi Mudaliyar. |
| 14. „ C. W. E. Cotton. | 45. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 15. „ V. Ch. John. | 46. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. |
| 16. „ M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. | 47. Mr. P. T. Rajan. |
| 17. „ Muhammad Tajudin Sahib. | 48. „ T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar. |
| 18. Munshi Abdul Wahab Sahib. | 49. Rao Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar. |
| 19. Mr. A. B. Shetty. | 50. Khan Bahadur S. K. Abdul Razack Sahib Bahadur. |
| 20. „ J. Bheemayya. | 51. Mr. Muhammad Kadir Mohidin Sahib. |
| 21. „ R. Foulkes. | 52. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. |
| 22. „ Mahmud Schammad Sahib. | 53. Khan Sahib T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur. |
| 23. „ J. Kuppuswami. | 54. Rao Bahadur K. Sitarama Reddi. |
| 24. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. | 55. „ B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 25. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. | 56. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi. |
| 26. „ K. Krishnan. | 57. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram. |
| 27. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. | 58. The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri. |
| 28. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai. | 59. Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao. |
| 29. „ W. P. A. Soundara Pandiya Nadar. | |
| 30. „ Daniel Thomas. | |
| 31. „ S. Venkiah. | |

Neutral.

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 4. The Zamindar of Seithur. |
| 2. „ J. A. Saldanha. | 5. The Zamindar of Gollapalli. |
| 3. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. | 6. Mr. R. Nagan Gowda. |
| | 7. „ B. Ramachandra Reddi. |

Ayes 20. Noes 59. Neutral 7.

The motion was lost.

26th March 1929]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I will now put the motion of the hon. the Finance Member to the vote of the House. The question is ‘ that the report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Audit and Appropriation Accounts of the Presidency of Madras for 1926-27 be taken into consideration ’.”

The motion was carried.

VI

THE MIRZAPURAM AND PEDAGONNUR IMPARTIBLE ESTATES BILL.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The motion that the consideration of the Bill be adjourned ^a was under consideration. Mr. Hameed Khan will now continue his speech.”

* Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I was speaking the other day on the adjournment motion moved by my friend Mr. Biswanath Das Mahasayo for postponement of the consideration of the Bill for three months. Sir, as I have stated, I do not see the need for the great hurry with which attempts have been made to enact into law the present Bill that has been before this House. The hurry that has been made by the mover of this Bill is, so far as I see, with a view to take away the legitimate rights of certain members of the zamindaris referred to in this Bill. As it was stated before, I see no reason why three months should not be given for the consideration of this Bill so that the claims of all the various families concerned will be scrutinized and that no wrong will be done to them. I therefore believe that the House will be doing an elementary act of justice to the members of the families concerned in this Bill by giving them an opportunity to place their case before the Members of this House so that we shall be prepared when we come next to the Council to see that their case does not go by default. It is with that object, Sir, that the motion is considered necessary for the purpose of giving three months’ time so that we might not pass the legislation in a hurry.”

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The question is ‘ that the consideration of the Bill be adjourned to a date three months hence ’.”

The motion was lost

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I will now put the Bill clause by clause for the consideration of the House.”

Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI :—“ I move that the figures ‘ 1929 ’ in clause 1 be substituted for ‘ 1928 ’.”

The ZAMINDAR OF GOLLAPALLI :—“ I second it.”

The motion was carried and clause 1 as amended was allowed to stand part of the Bill.

* Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—“ I do not propose to move the first portion of my amendment to clause 2. I shall move the second portion of it.”

^a Please see proceedings of the 26th February 1929.

[26th March 1929]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member is aware that the second portion affects civil rights and therefore he ought to have obtained the previous sanction of the Governor-General. He has not obtained such sanction and therefore the hon. Member cannot move that amendment."

Clause 2 was put to the House and carried and allowed to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 3 was put to the House and carried and allowed to stand part of the Bill.

The Preamble was put to the House and carried and allowed to stand part of the Bill.

Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI:—"I now move that the Bill be passed into law."

The ZAMINDAR OF GOLLAPALLI:—"I second it."

3-45 p.m. Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasaya:—"I oppose the motion that the Bill be passed into law."

* Mr. P. ANJANEYULU:—"I also support this opposing motion. Sir, we want certain guarantees. Not that the proletariat or the ryots are more interested in the junior members of the zamindari family than the zamindars themselves. We want some assurances to be given on their behalf. The interests of those that will be affected by this Bill when passed into law will have to be protected. Unless such a guarantee is given and their maintenance is ensured on an adequate scale it will be very hard; and in the interests of justice to those who are not present here such a guarantee should be given. If such guarantees are given and they are placed on a statutory basis and proper and adequate maintenance is guaranteed to the junior members of the family, I do not think any hon. Member will have any objection."

The ZAMINDAR OF GOLLAPALLI:—"I am sorry that we have been unnecessarily misunderstood by my hon. Friends on this side of the House. I am not now concerned with the various charges and allegations that have been levelled against us in the various speeches that have been made, but anyhow in order to clarify the issue at hand, let me state that this motion is unnecessary in view of the assurance I make on behalf of the zamindars."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"There is no motion except the motion that the Bill be passed into law."

The ZAMINDAR OF GOLLAPALLI:—"For the purpose of clarifying the position let me state that this opposition is unnecessary. In view of the assurance that I make on behalf of the zamindars in the House that we as a class are certainly in favour of suitable provisions being made for the junior members of the zamindari families, and in view of the fact that we are prepared to give our sympathetic consideration and support to the principles underlying the Bill moved by my hon. Friend Mr. Biswanath Das I hope the hon. Member who opposed the passing of this Bill into law will withdraw his motion."

* Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI:—"I am very much surprised at the statement made by my hon. Friend, Mr. Anjaneyulu, and the reply given by my hon. Friend, the Zamindar of Gollapalli. It appears as if they have formed a

26th March 1929]

[Mr. K. V. R. Swami]

pact about this matter, viz., that one should object to this Bill being passed into law and the other should give assurance and after which the objection should be withdrawn. It is a very nice arrangement between them and I do not quarrel with them. That may be a very good thing so far as those two gentlemen are concerned. My hon. Friend Mr. Anjaneyulu represents the members of this party or the members of this House as much as my hon. Friend the Zamindar of Gollapalli represents the whole body of zamindars. So, their agreement is as much binding on the members of this House as it is on the zamindars. I want to make my position very clear. I have nothing to do with this pact or compromise. It is not for us to go on bended knees and ask these zamindars whose estates have been made impartible 'Please protect your children, do not allow them to be at the public charge.' It is not our business. If this House consents to a Bill like this, it must have taken into its consideration how these poor children ought to be protected. This House ought to have taken into their consideration whether these children of the zamindars have been well provided, or whether they have to go to court or whether they have to be protected by other people. That is a different thing altogether. Our objection to this Bill is that we should not perpetuate a system which was brought into existence at the time of the East India Company. Because at the time of the East India Company they sold away certain portions of their territories to a class of people called the zamindars and they collected permanent revenue from them and while selling those portions they also sold away the interests of the people, who were really in possession of portions of the lands in their own right, we do not want that the same system should be continued. Now if estates after estates should come forward with a Bill of this sort and want to make this system of impartible estates a permanent institution as it were, we have to oppose it, because it is not in the interest of the people that these zamindaris should be perpetuated as long as the world lasts. If the people think that some of these impartible estates newly created do no good to the people, they can as well when they are sufficiently strong bring in a Bill into this Council and repeal these Acts. So, it is no good on the part of any hon. Member of this House to give an assurance that we are quite satisfied with this Bill and that the only thing that we want is that the children of the zamindari families should be given sufficient allowance for their maintenance and so on. Of course my hon. Friend Sir A. P. Patro says: 'It is quite right, you can keep quiet.' I am told he is a little bit of a zamindar himself and he may perhaps introduce a Bill called Sir Patro's Bill. But representing as we do the interests of the people, we ought to see how their interests are jeopardized by this Bill. We are more interested in the general public than my hon. Friend is interested in the body of the zamindars and so I make my position quite clear and oppose the passing of this Bill."

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed into law.

VII

A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS ABKARI ACT, 1886.

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Madras Abkari Act, 1886, as amended by the Select Committee be taken into consideration."

Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU :—"I second it."

[26th March 1929]

Clause 1.

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I beg to move that in clause 1 the figures '1929' be substituted for the figures '1928'."

Mr. D. NARAYANA RAJU :—"I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 1 as amended was put, passed and added to the Bill.

Clauses 2 and 3.

* The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—"I beg to move that in place of clause 2 the following shall be substituted :—

'2. To section 15 of the Madras Abkari Act, 1886 (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the following explanation shall be added, namely :—

"Explanation.—The supply of liquor by clubs to their members on payment of a price or of any fee or subscription is not a sale within the meaning of this section but a fee according to a scale of fees to be fixed by the Government shall be levied from such clubs by the Commissioner."

"Sir, the object of the amendment of Mr. Saldanha is that these clubs which are selling liquor shall not be in a more advantageous position than the shops. His view is that these shops are handicapped because of compulsory licences and that both the clubs and the shops should have licences from the Commissioner. Licences make certain sections of the Abkari Act applicable and these sections refer to the amount of liquor and the quality of liquor which is to be kept in shops. As regards clubs the members will satisfy themselves as to the quality of liquor. So compulsory licences are not necessary in the case of clubs. The Government are only concerned with the revenue and so far as that is concerned the fee proposed in the amendment will do. The Government agree that a fee might be levied from these clubs just as it is levied from these shops. So, I move that the explanation that I have moved above may be added to section 15. (An hon. Member: 'Why not move clause by clause?')

"Sir, an hon. Member suggests that I should move clause by clause. So I move the first amendment to section 15 as above."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I find it is necessary that both the clauses must be amended in the order in which they are proposed by the hon. Minister. Therefore it is much better to discuss the whole amendment and put each clause of the hon. Minister to the vote of the House separately. I think that will be more convenient."

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—"The second amendment that I wish to move runs as follows :—

'3. To section 36 of the said Act the following proviso shall be added, namely :—

"Provided that the persons called upon to attend and witness such searches shall include at least two persons neither of whom is an abkari, police or village officer."

26th March 1929] [Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar]

"Sir, the section as amended by the Select Committee says that the witnesses shall not be Government officials and the witnesses shall be non-officials. Government accept that two may be non-officials, but I want to point out that officials should not be absolutely debarred from being witnesses. The Bill states that two of the witnesses shall be non-officials and we have no objection to that, but why should we debar Government officials from being witnesses to a search. That is the reason for my amendment. I move that this amendment may be accepted."

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—"I second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"In the Bill of Mr. Saldanha, clause 2 deals with section 33 of the Act, whereas clause 3 deals with section 15 of the Act. Generally the amending Bills will have to deal with these clauses in their numerical order. That is the only mistake I find. However, I think the whole debate may go on and the clauses may be put as proposed by the hon. the Minister."

"The question is 'for clauses 2 and 3 of the Select Committee Report, 4 p.m. the amendments of the hon. the Minister be substituted'."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"Sir, so far as the first amendment is concerned, after a careful examination of my own original proposal which I framed on the Bombay law and the amendment proposed by the hon. Minister, I do not think there is any essential difference between the two. The reason why the Bombay Government introduced the Bill was to have control over the sale of liquor in clubs. The Bombay Government say that the disposal of liquor in the clubs is not a sale. A letter was received from the Government of Bombay and it was circulated to the hon. Members of the Council. It says: 'I am to state that previously to 1st April 1928, the secretary of each club was required to submit to the Collector of the district on the 1st April and the 1st October every year, in such form as the Collector prescribed, a true and correct account of all spirits received, consumed and held in stock at the club. On receipt of this information the Collector assessed the fee for each club on the basis of the purchases made by it during the previous six months in accordance with the following scale:—' My amendment and the amendment of the hon. Minister are practically the same. The sale of liquor and the disposal of liquor come under the control of the Revenue authorities, i.e., the Excise Department, and they levy a fee."

"The question whether it is a sale or not is left to the discretion of the Government either in Bombay or here, and they can fix any fee they like; they have got all sorts of arbitrary fees; for certain shops a fee of Rs. 250 is levied; for some shops it is Rs. 1,000. If the sale of liquor is by casks, a fee of Rs. 1,000 is levied; if it is in bottles, a fee of Rs. 500 is levied. Once the clubs are brought under the control of the authorities, the Government are at liberty to fix any fees they like. The Government will be anxious to fix as high a fee as is consistent with the necessities of the situation and requirements. So far as that clause is concerned, I raise no serious objection, though the form of my amendment would have been better. As for the other amendment, I think there is serious objection. My original intention was to see that these searches should be made in the presence of non-officials and that there should be no official witnesses at all, so that responsible independent witnesses will be able to give evidence. The effect of the amendment of the hon. Minister is this: there will be five persons; two of them are

[Mr. J. A. Saldanha]

o[26th March 1929]

to be non-officials, others may be officials. The tendency of a subordinate magistrate would be to accept the evidence of the officials. As long as we have not got magistrates who are not independent, they would be influenced by the official evidence, because they are dependent on their superior officers. I therefore object to the second amendment."

Mr. K. R. KARANT :—"Sir, I am surprised to see my hon. Friend, Mr. Saldanha, accepting the amendment of the Government which has a far-reaching effect. Two points are involved in this amendment. I shall first deal with the amendment to section 15. The chief objection is that the quantity of liquor sold in these clubs is not known and secondly they do not pay any income to the Government. There is the question of finance and the question of having an idea of the exact amount of sale; there is the question also of the provisions that are consequential upon section 15 of the Abkari Act. This is not a new amendment. In fact, the amendment in the Select Committee Report has been incorporated word for word from the amendment to a Bill brought forward by a Bombay Member of Government in the year 1925. The wording of that Bill, which was passed without any amendment in the Council, is as follows :—'Supply of liquor to their members on payment of any fee or subscription is a sale within the meaning of this section.' The speech of the Abkari Commissioner who made a long speech explaining the necessity for this Bill is found at pages 824 to 829 of the proceedings of the Bombay Legislative Council on 31st July 1925. I shall quote a few passages to show that the conditions in this Presidency are not very different from those in Bombay except perhaps that we have not got as many bogus clubs as there are in Bombay. The reasons given by the Abkari Commissioner of Excise are as follows :—'The first reason was, as mentioned by the hon. Member, the recommendation of the Excise Committee. It was found that if you are to control country liquor effectively, you must simultaneously—at least to a certain extent—control foreign liquor.' If we accept the amendment of the Government, we shall not be able to have any check on the quantity of foreign liquor sold in clubs, because it will not come under section 15 of the Act. I think, Sir, I have made my position clear. Section 15 says that sale of foreign liquor in these shops is not a sale. The amendment of the hon. Minister is that it is not a sale and it authorizes the Government to collect a certain fee; nothing more than that. The Government will have no power to reduce or control the quantity which power they have under the provisions of section 15 of the Act and other sections consequential upon it. That section says that no liquor can be sold without a licence from the Collector. If we accept the amendment of the Government, the Government would be entitled only to collect certain fees from these clubs; the sale of liquor cannot be prohibited or controlled; nor will there be any necessity to obtain a licence from the Collector. I shall quote further the speech of the Member of the Bombay Council: 'There was a border line over which these two practically overlapped. The second reason was that these bogus clubs began to increase enormously. Probably hon. Members do not know the number of such clubs now existing in the city of Bombay itself. Some of them are in the very heart of the Fort and they are doing a very good business. The third reason is finance. Really these clubs are doing serious damage to our excise revenue, because many of the restaurants and shops near these bogus clubs had practically to shut down and this has reduced our revenue. I want to point out that even exclusive clubs like the Carlton, the Athæneum, and

26th March 1929]

[Mr. K. R. Karant]

Marlborough of London, clubs of which His Majesty the King is a regular member, are all licensed in England and I do not see what objection there can be to the licensing of our Indian clubs. What I wanted to point out was that this Act is really concerned with the control and it is not directly concerned with licensing conditions. I am sure that no genuine club need be afraid of these conditions which will have to be approved by Government after due consideration of the status of these clubs. In any case these rules are proposed to be based exactly on the same lines as the rules in England so that there will be no greater restrictions in India than in England. In fact I think that in England the restrictions are still greater. Probably hon. Members are not aware that English clubs come under two Acts, the Licensing Act under which every club has to be registered and there are very strict rules laid down. One of these conditions is that no member can send for a single bottle of liquor from the premises of these clubs, for being drunk outside but it is not so here. Again the clubs have to submit many returns and for each return they have got to pay a fee of five shillings. And again, they are under a second Act, namely, the Finance Act, under which they have got to pay six pence on every pound of purchase. I wanted to point out to the hon. Member that in England this extra payment of six pence has to be made. I do not think it is necessary for me to mention any other facts. All I can say is that this provision is essential for the proper carrying out of Government policy and to put a stop to or a check on the increasing demand for cheap foreign liquor.'

"I think I have made it sufficiently clear that the two points to which the Member of the Bombay Government referred to were accepted by the Council. It was a Bill brought forward by the Government. It was not strongly opposed even by the European Members of the Council. The two points are, all clubs come under section 15 of the Act and the supply of liquor in these clubs is sale within the meaning of the section. The amendment brought forward by the Government says that the supply of liquor by clubs is not a sale. The Government simply collects a little fee from these clubs. These are points to which we cannot agree. I hope the hon. Mover of this Bill will reconsider his position in the light of what I have submitted.

"Regarding the second amendment, I must submit that the amendment of the hon. Minister makes the position worse than what it is at present.

"The position now is that under section 36 of the Abkari Act, 'searches under the provisions of this Act shall be made in accordance with the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure'. Now, if you refer to the Code of Criminal Procedure, it says how a search has to be made. Section 103 (1) runs as follows:—

- Before making a search under this Chapter, the officer or other person about to make it shall call upon two or more respectable inhabitants of the locality in which the place to be searched is situate to attend and witness the search, and may issue an order in writing to them or any of them so to do.'

"The important point to be noticed in connexion with this is that the officer about to make a search shall have to call upon two respectable inhabitants of the locality. As the law stands at present, I understand that ordinarily no abkari officer or a Government servant can be an attester to a search. The section contemplates two important respectable inhabitants of the locality. If you take the natural meaning of the section, I take it

4-15
p.m.

[Mr. K. R. Karant.] • [26th March 1929]

that any abkari officer cannot in any ordinary sense be a respectable inhabitant of the locality. Now, the amendment of the hon. Minister means that there may be more than two witnesses, say five witnesses or any number of witnesses, but at least two of them shall not be abkari officers or police or village officers, thereby impliedly meaning that there may be two independent witnesses, but the other may be abkari or village officers. Now, the danger in this is that a search may be attested by two independent witnesses. There is no guarantee as regards the exclusion of the abkari or village officers from being witnesses in a court of law. In a court of law only two independent witnesses should be called. Now, if a search is attended by four persons, Government may choose to summon only the abkari or village officers and leave out the independent witnesses of the locality. Therefore, my humble submission is that this amendment only takes us to a position which is worse than the existing law. If we give a proper meaning to the Criminal Procedure Code, the abkari or police or village officers are not respectable persons of the locality and it would not be proper for them to attest searches.

“If we accept the amendment of the hon. the Minister, which provides :

‘ Provided that the persons called upon to attend and witness such searches shall include at least two persons neither of whom is an abkari, police or village officer.’

“Thereby, this amendment indirectly permits persons who are abkari, village or police officers to attest. There is nothing in it compelling two respectable inhabitants of the locality to be cited as witnesses by Government because all persons who attest a search are not liable to be called to prove the search. According to the amendment of the Minister, there can be any number of persons, but there must be at least two respectable inhabitants, and there is no rule that two independent respectable inhabitants alone are entitled to speak about the search so that it will be open to the Abkari department to cite only those persons of the Abkari or Police department to prove the search. Therefore, it is my humble conviction that the present amendment is worse than the existing law and should not be accepted. I hope therefore that both the amendments of the hon. Minister will be thrown out and the Bill as it stands will be accepted by the House.”

* Mr. P. C. VENKATAPATI RAJU :—“Mr. President, Sir, the explanation that is sought to be introduced by the hon. the Minister for Excise to section 15 of the Madras Abkari Act is really an exposition of his real intentions with regard to prohibition in this country. I can understand the hon. Minister saying that with regard to the financial adjustments, some time may be required for bringing in the prohibition law. Here is an amendment to the Abkari Act brought by an hon. Member wherein there is a possibility of public finances being increased instead of being diminished, and at the same time advancing the cause of prohibition. The explanation which he seeks to introduce really defeats the purpose of the very amendment of the hon. the Private Member and I agree along with my hon. Friend, Mr Karant, with the remark that the hon. Member, the mover of the Bill, has shown some sort of consideration to the Minister's amendment. The hon. Minister was saying that he was for the restriction of drink and that he was for the abolition of shops. Now, perhaps, the hon. Minister wants that if shops are closed, further clubs should crop up. There is nothing in the Abkari Act to prevent the sale of

26th March 1929]

[Mr. P. C. Venkatapati Raju]

even country liquor by the clubs and the special object of getting a reduction in drink by abolishing some of the shops in the localities cannot be achieved, if this amendment is carried, for some sort of club will crop up, may be a club of drunkards with some other name and they will be at liberty to sell any sort of liquor to any extent till any time and at the same time not pay any revenue to the public finances. My hon. Friend the Excise Minister was always trying to take precedents from the Bombay Government. Anything that is done by the Bombay Government which fails to bring any desired effect will certainly be placed before us and that he says he is going to follow the example of the Bombay Government. In this even the Bombay Government has stated that supply of liquor to members of the club is a sale under the Abkari Act. Now, he wants this House to make it not a sale and the object of the hon. Minister is not really in public interests or even in the interests of the finances of this province. Therefore, I think that this amendment should not be accepted and I think the hon. Minister for Excise would give up his amendment and allow the amendment brought forward by the hon. Mr. Saldanha to go without much opposition and without taking up much time of the House."

* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" Mr. President, Sir I do not intend taking more than a few minutes. The hon. Minister has achieved his aim of prohibition but enlarged the quantity of drink by his explanation. My hon. Friend from South Kanara did not notice evidently that the Bombay Government in the reply that they gave had control over the quantity that the clubs could use. They have also other expedients by which they can control the drink in clubs and they have also other safeguards. They have specifically declared that it was a sale within the meaning of the Abkari Act. Here the whole thing is topsy-turvy. Our hon. Minister who has devoted 4 lakhs for propaganda work now comes forward with an explanation which would bring in a crop of clubs day by day, where people might drink whatever quantity they liked. Moreover, the Commissioner of Excise has a right of fixing the rates, and in the case of clubs there rates might possibly be lower than the others and that will be another incentive to further drink. Therefore, this kind of amendment is absolutely futile and it only conveys to this House and to the world the policy of the Minister. If it is not intended that his policy should be consummated in this manner, it is well that he withdraws his motion."

Mr. W. P. A. SOUNDARA PANDIA NADAR :—" I move that the question be now put."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that the question be now put "

The closure motion was put to the House and declared carried.

Mr. K. R. Karant demanded a poll and the House divided thus :

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks. | 5. The hon. Mr. M. R. Seturathnam Ayyar. |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir. | 7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan |
| 4. " Diwan Bahadur Krishnan Nayar. | 8. Mr. Hilton Brown. |
| | 9. " H. A. Watson. |
| | 10. " S. H. Slater. |

[26th March 1929]

Ayes—cont.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 11. Mr. C. A. Souter. | 32. Mr. S. Arpudawami Udayar. |
| 12. " A. McG. C. Tampoe. | 33. Zamindar of Kallikota. |
| 13. " C. W. E. Cotton. | 34. Khan Sahib P. Kalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. |
| 14. " V. Ch. John. | 35. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam. |
| 15. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. | 36. Mr. V. Ramjee Rao. |
| 16. Syed Tajudin Sahib Bahadur. | 37. Zamindar of Gollapalli. |
| 17. Mr. J. Bheemayya. | 38. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 18. " R. Foulkes. | 39. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabbapati Mudaliyar. |
| 19. Muhamud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur. | 40. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 20. Mr. J. Kuppuswami. | 41. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajula Nayudu. |
| 21. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappah Bahadur. | 42. Mr. P. T. Rajan. |
| 22. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. | 43. " T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar. |
| 23. " K. Krishnan. | 44. " Khadir Mohidin Sahib. |
| 24. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. | 45. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. |
| 25. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai. | 46. Rao Bahadur K. Sitarama Reddi. |
| 26. " W. P. A. Soundara Pandia Nadar. | 47. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 27. " S. Venkiah. | 48. Zamindar of Mirzapuram. |
| 28. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. | 49. Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri. |
| 29. Mr. W. O. Wright. | 50. Mr. A. B. Bhanoji Rao. |
| 30. " F. E. James. | |
| 31. " R. J. C. Robertson. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Mr. P. C. Venkatapati Raju. | 14. Mr. K. R. Karant. |
| 2. " K. Koti Reddi. | 15. " P. Anjaneyulu. |
| 3. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 16. " A. Parasurama Rao. |
| 4. " Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 17. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 5. " S. Satyamurti. | 18. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 6. " J. A. Saldanha. | 19. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 7. " G. Harisarvottama Rao. | 20. " C. Obi Reddi. |
| 8. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur. | 21. " C. Venkatarangam Nayudu. |
| 9. Mr. C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 22. " K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar. |
| 10. Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur. | 23. " A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 11. Mr. K. V. R. Swami. | 24. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 12. " D. Narayana Raju. | |
| 13. Dr. B. S. Mallayya. | |

Ayes 50. Noes 24.

The closure motion was carried.

4-30 p.m. * The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I now put the main motion to the vote of the House. In doing so I shall put it in three parts.

'Re-number clauses 2 and 3 as 3 and 2 respectively. That is only a verbal amendment.'

The motion was put to vote and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"For clause 2 as re-numbered, substitute clause 2 as in the motion of the Minister, viz., 'To section 15 of the Madras Abkari Act, 1886 (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the following explanation shall be added, namely:—

'*Explanation.*—The supply of liquor by clubs to their members on payment of a price or of any fee or subscription is not a sale within the meaning of this section but a fee according to a scale of fees to be fixed by the Government shall be levied from such clubs by the Commissioner.'

26th March 1929]*

The motion was put to vote and lost. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks. | 24. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami. |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 25. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |
| 3. " Mr. T. E. Moir. | 26. " W. P. A. Soundara Pandia Nadar. |
| 4. " Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 27. " S. Venkiah. |
| 5. " Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 28. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan. |
| 6. " Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar. | 29. Mr. W. O. Wright. |
| 7. " Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 30. " F. E. James. |
| 8. Mr. Hilton Brown. | 31. " R. J. C. Robertson. |
| 9. " H. A. Watson. | 32. " S. Arpudaswami Udayar. |
| 10. " O. A. Souter. | 33. Zamindar of Kallikota. |
| 11. " S. H. Slater. | 34. Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. |
| 12. " A. McG. C. Tampoe. | 35. Swami A. S. Sabajanandam. |
| 13. " C. W. E. Cotton. | 36. Mr. V. Ramjee Rao. |
| 14. " V. Ch. John. | 37. Zamindar of Gollapalli. |
| 15. " M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. | 38. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 16. " Muhammad Syed Tajudin Sahib. | 39. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. |
| 17. " J. Bheemayya. | 40. Mr. P. T. Rajan. |
| 18. " R. Foulkes. | 41. " T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar. |
| 19. " Mahmud Schamnad Sahib. | 42. Muhammad Kadir Mohidin Sahib. |
| 20. " J. Kuppuswami. | 43. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. |
| 21. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. | 44. Rao Bahadur K. Sitarama Reddi. |
| 22. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai. | 45. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram. |
| 23. " K. Krishnan. | 46. Mr. A. V. Bhanaji Rao. |

Noes.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1. Mr. P. C. Venkataswami Raju. | 15. Mr. P. Anjaneyulu. |
| 2. " K. Koti Reddi. | 16. " C. Obi Reddi. |
| 3. " R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 17. " A. Parasurama Rao. |
| 4. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti. | 18. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 5. " S. Satyamurti. | 19. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao. |
| 6. " J. A. Saldanha. | 20. " K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar. |
| 7. " G. Harisaravattama Rao. | 21. " C. Venkatarangam Nayudu. |
| 8. " Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib. | 22. " K. S. Sivasubrahmayya Ayyar. |
| 9. " C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar. | 23. " A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 10. " Abdul Hameed Khan. | 24. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 11. " K. V. R. Swami. | 25. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar. |
| 12. " D. Narayana Raju. | 26. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 13. Dr. B. S. Mallayya. | |
| 14. Mr. K. R. Karant. | |

Neutral.

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi. | 2. Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri. |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|

Ayes 46. Noes 26. Neutral 2.

The motion was carried.

*The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" For clause 3 as re-numbered, substitute clause 3 in the hon. the Minister's motion, namely, 'To section 36 of the said Act, the following proviso shall be added, namely, "Provided that the persons called upon to attend and witness such searches shall include at least two persons neither of whom is an abkari, police or village officer" '."

*The motion was put to vote and carried.

*The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that clauses 2 and 3 as amended shall stand part of the Bill."

The motion was put to vote and carried.

[26th March 1929]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Now the preamble is for the consideration of the House."

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" I move that in line 1 before the words ' to amend ' insert the word ' further ' ; in line 2 after the figures ' 1886 ' insert the words ' for the purpose hereinafter appearing ' ; in line 3 omit the words ' and of the Governor ' ; and in line 4 for the words ' it is enacted ' substitute the words ' it is hereby enacted ' ."

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" I second the motion."

The preamble amendment was then put and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is the preamble as amended do stand part of the Bill "

The motion was put to vote and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The amendment of the title standing in the name of the hon. the Minister is more a business of the Secretary, and I therefore do not put it to the vote of the House."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" I do not make any motion that the Bill be passed into law."

VIII

A BILL TO DECLARE THE ELLAMARRU AND PENJENDRA ESTATES IMPARTIBLE.

Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" Sir, I beg to move that the Bill to declare the Ellamarru and Penjendra Estates to be impartible be taken into consideration."

The ZAMINDAR OF GOLLAFALLI :—" I second the motion."

The motion was put and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Clause 1 is for the consideration of the House. In clause 1 for the figures ' 1928 ' substitute ' 1929 ' ."

Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" In clause 1 for the figures ' 1928 ' substitute ' 1929 ' ."

The motion was put and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Clause 2 is for the consideration of the House."

" (After a pause) The question is that clauses 2 and 3 shall stand part of the Bill."

The motion was put and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The preamble is for the consideration of the House."

" The question is the preamble shall stand part of the Bill."

The motion was put and carried.

Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" I now move the Bill be passed into law."

Mr. P. T. RAJAN :—" I second it."

A BILL TO DECLARE THE ELLAMARRU AND PENJENDRA ESTATES IMPARTIBLE

26th March 1929]

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is the Bill to declare the Ellamarru and Penjendra estates to be impartible be passed into law."

The motion was put to vote and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The Council will now adjourn and re-assemble to-morrow at 11 o'clock."

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.



[26th March 1929]

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to question No. 1910 asked by Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 26th March 1929, page 858 supra.]

G.O. Mis. No. 1194, L. & M., dated 30th March 1927.

As the law stands at present presidents of district boards have no power to restrict the number of motor buses plying for hire on any road by refusing to grant a licence to a bus, provided the grant of such licence is otherwise unobjectionable. The proper way to limit the number of public motor vehicles on any road and incidentally to secure the funds required to repair the damage done by them to the road is to fix the licence fee at a figure which will cover the cost of repair of the wear and tear caused.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Education and
Local Self-Government)

C. B. COTTERELL,
Secretary to Government.

To all Presidents of District Boards (except Chingleput, Vizagapatam and North Arcot).

Copies to all Collectors.

Copy to the Law (General) Department.

„ „ Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 1916 asked by Dr. B. S. Mallayya at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 26th March 1929, page 862 supra.]

ANNEXURE.

Reports of the Committee appointed by the Surgeon-General to investigate the recent outbreak of cholera in the General Hospital, Madras.

First Report.

Letter from the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras,
R. No. 2454-General of 1928, dated 29th January 1929.

[Reference.—My letters Nos. 2454-1 G and 2454-2 G of 1928, dated 10th and 11th December 1928, on the occurrence of cholera in the Government General Hospital.]

I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of the report of the Committee consisting of Lieut.-Col. J. M. Skinner, I.M.S., Lieut.-Col. H. H. King, I.M.S., and M.R.Ry. Rao Bahadur M. R. Guruswami Mudaliyar Avargal, B.A., M.D.C.M., which has considered the recent outbreak of cholera in the Government General Hospital, with the remarks of the Superintendent, Government General Hospital, thereon.

26th March 1929].

2. The Superintendent, Government General Hospital, was since requested to report the steps taken to prevent the risk of similar occurrence of outbreak of cholera in the hospital and also what further action he considers necessary with the same object. A copy of the reply received from the Superintendent in the matter, No. R. 186-G/28, dated 23rd January 1929, is enclosed for the information of Government.

3. This outbreak is very remarkable in that there is convincing evidence that no less than seven cholera carriers were admitted to hospital during a short period of time. All of these were suffering from other diseases and showed none of the clinical manifestations of cholera. Isolated cases of this type are by no means uncommon, but that seven should occur within a few days is so extraordinary a happening that I should refuse to believe it if the evidence were not so complete. The disquieting feature of the outbreak is that several patients actually acquired the infection while in hospital and the most important points in connexion with the enquiry are to find out how the patients might have become infected and how to prevent such an occurrence from happening again. The possible means of conveyance of the infection in this case are (1) flies and (2) the hands of nurses, ward servants or the patients themselves.

(1) There were opportunities for flies to convey the infection, neither the isolation ward, the latrines, nor the kitchens were fly-proofed. There were plenty of flies in the wards and although the patients had fly-proof lockers all of which were in good condition, it is likely that the doors of these may have been left open at times. The latrines have had flushing arrangements, but it is quite likely that stools may remain exposed to the visits of flies for considerable periods of time.

(2) The hands of nurses are not likely to convey infection; facilities are provided for the nurses to disinfect their hands but it is possible that inexperienced nurses may not recognize the necessity for strict precaution in this respect.

The ward servants are not supposed to handle the food of the patients, but many things happen which are not supposed to happen and it is within the bounds of possibility that the ward servants or the patients themselves may have been responsible for conveying infection. On the whole it seems likely that flies were the culprits. One of the surprising things is that the hospital should have remained so free from occurrences of this kind in the past; the lack of fly-proofing of the latrines and kitchens is a serious defect in the sanitation of the hospital. The Superintendent has been asked to obtain plans and estimates for the remedy of the defects which have been found to exist in the hospital.

(3) The question of fly-proofing latrines and kitchens in all our hospitals is being considered.

*A report on the occurrence of some cases of cholera in the
Madras General Hospital in December 1928.*

I. Introduction.—This report is to be considered along with the statement of 12th December 1928, showing the cases of cholera ward by ward. Only bacteriologically certain, or in the absence of bacteriological examination, clinically certain cases are here considered to be cholera. Of the 22 cases here recorded, 12 did not appear to be cholera clinically. They were

[26th March 1929]

either cases of dysentery, or of diarrhoea in patients with other diseases such as tuberculosis and enteric. All these 12 'cases' have been diagnosed bacteriologically and would probably not have been found to have been cholera apart from such an examination. They have been detected through all cases of diarrhoea and dysentery being examined bacteriologically. It is to be noted that about fifty other similar cases of diarrhoea, etc., have been examined with negative results.

The ward distribution is as follows:—

No cases in two wards	... Canning and Donovan.
One case in each six wards	... Munro, Denison, Maitland, Mary, Florence and Buckingham.
Two cases in one ward	... Trevelyan.
Three cases in two wards	... Victoria and Havelock.
Four cases in two wards	... Yale, Mortimer with the special ward.

Thus, though the cases are scattered, they are mainly in the last four wards. If we assume as a convenient theory that, once a case of cholera has occurred in a ward and has remained there for a day or more, we may regard it as the direct or indirect source of the next few cases in that ward so long as these occurred at an interval of 2—6 days from the primary case, then we have to ascertain (1) the source of the primary case, (2) the exact methods by which the secondary cases were infected from the primary—whether by flies or by the hands of nurses and attendants. This last is not easy to determine and will need further investigation. So for the present we will confine our attention to the primary cases and the possible origin of their infection.

We shall first deal with wards whose sources of infection are easy to find.

II. Ward distribution—(1) Havelock.—A case (Veerasami) was admitted with 'dysentery' on 2nd December 1928. Later he was found to have cholera. In all probability he had cholera to start with. He was probably the source of infection for a patient (Babu) in a bed near by. The remaining case (Ramiah Nayudu) was also a primary case directly admitted for dysentery. Thus there were two primary direct admissions and one secondary case.

(2) Mortimer Special.—A woman (Meenakshi) admitted for cervicitis had diarrhoea practically from the date of admission and was recently found positive for cholera. She is the probable source of infection for the other cases in Mortimer, except possibly for Manonmani a case of 'tuberculosis' who may also have been a primary case admitted on 22nd November 1928 for she always had diarrhoea.

(3) Victoria.—A woman (Madavi Ammal) admitted on 30th November had diarrhoea on 2nd December and died in the ward with symptoms of cholera on the night of the 4–5th December. She is the probable source of infection of the other two cases.

(4) Florence.—A single case admitted with tubercular enteritis on 6th December 1928 was found to have cholera vibrios in the faeces—so probably a carrier.

26th March 1929]

(5) *Buckingham*.—One case admitted with cholera developed symptoms within 5 hours of admission.

(6) *Trevelyan*.—Patient (Peer Mahomed) admitted into Yale on 25th November and transferred to Trevelyan on the 26th, where he was operated on (Gastro enterostomy). He got dysenteric diarrhoea on the 1st December and remained in the ward until the 9th December when bacteriological examination showed that he had cholera. The origin of his infection is obscure. It is possible that he was a carrier and that the disease was brought off by the operation, or he may have been infected while in Yale, which seems the more probable—see paragraph 9 below. This case may have been the source of infection for the other Trevelyan case (Thomas)—unless the latter was infected in Munro while there for 24 hours on the 4-5th.

(7) *Yale*.—The first case on the list (Nagappa) a case admitted in August had cholera while in the ward from 6th to 7th December, and was almost certainly the source of infection for the rest judging from the fact that they occurred three days later.

(8) *Munro*.—Edwin Jayaseelan, a patient, got cholera on the 5th, for origin of infection see below.

(9) *Origin of primary foci in Yale, Trevelyan, and Munro*.—It is probable that these last two primary cases in Munro and Yale respectively got their infection from the isolation ward in which there was at this time a patient (Abdul Jaffar) admitted with cholera diagnosed clinically on the 9th November. He was retained in the hospital because he got broncho pneumonia. Bacteriologically examined on 11th December he was found negative then. It is noteworthy that the single case in Munro was in one of the four exterior beds nearest the isolation block, and that the first of the series of cases in Yale was in bed No. 8 also near the isolation ward. This suggests fly borne infection. The first case in Trevelyan, Peer Mahomed, was either infected there or more probably in Yale, if as is probably the case, the infection was fly borne. He had occupied an emergency bed on the floor in Yale in some position unknown. Another possibility is infection by attendants. The relieving nurse during nurses' meal hours worked all three wards, Yale, Munro and the isolation ward. So that is a possibility, but we think that the evidence suggests that fly infection is more probable.

(10) *Denison*.—One case. Origin obscure. Appeared to have acute dysentery.

Possibilities—

(1) Infected from Trevelyan nearby from patient Peer Mahomed.

(2) Auto infection after operation—for piles.

(11) *Maitland*.—Cholera in an enteric case.

(12) *Mary*.—One case.

It is possible that the Maitland case who died in the last stage of enteric with diarrhoea was a cholera carrier, and it is possible that the Mary case got its infection from food surreptitiously conveyed to her from outside by relations, but on the whole it would be best to consider the origin of these two cases as doubtful—fly borne infection is always a possibility.

III. General sources of infection—(1) *Water and Food*.—The water-supply has been examined and found free from cholera vibrios. The ordinary routine is to supply only boiled water for drinking. All milk supplied is also boiled. The distribution of cases is quite against the theory of an infection of the water or the general food or milk supply.

[26th March 1929]

(2) *Nurses and staff*.—There is no good evidence connecting any special members of the staff with being carriers of the disease. Casual infection in wards can of course be caused by the hands. The stools of a few nurses, of all the cooks of the hospital, and of all the orderlies in Yale ward, have been examined bacteriologically for cholera with negative results.

(3) *Flies*.—There are usually a few flies about more particularly in the lower wards on the south side. Fly papers are as a routine in general use. As noted probably some of the infections were fly borne.

IV. Conclusion.—(1) In the first five wards mentioned it seems clear that there were no less than seven cases of infection from outside the hospital who were admitted for various other diseases while infected with cholera. They were either carriers or were in the incubation period of the disease. Seeing that this is the second year of an epidemic of cholera in Madras, it is probable that many ordinary patients are carriers and it is to be remembered that the capacity to infect others is greatly increased by saline purges as is common in hospitals. All new admissions are now being examined bacteriologically to investigate this point. From these seven primary cases or carriers, five secondary cases developed in the wards mentioned.

(2) There is another group of eight cases in Yale, Munro, Trevelyan and Denison, in which the primary cases were perhaps infected while they were in Yale or Munro wards from a patient in the isolation ward.

(3) There are no definite indications of the source of the remaining two cases.

Havelock ward.

Number and name.	Disease.	Date of admission.	Date of symptoms.	Bac. result.	Disposal.
1. Veeraswami Pillai.	B. Dysentery..	2/12	2/12	Plus 8/12	F. Shed 8/12 died.
2. Ramayya Nayudu.	Pyrexia and motions G blood.	4/12	8/12	Plus 9/12	F. Shed 9/12.
3. Balu	K.A.	17/11	6/12	Plus 6/12	F. Shed 6/12 I.H.D. 9/12.

Mortimer ward.

1. Devakiammal ..	Hammer-rehoids.	3/12	3/12	Not sent.	F. Shed 12/12 I.P.H. 12/12.
2. Viruthambal ..	Lupus ..	28/6	10/12	Do.	F. Shed 12/12 I.D.H. 12/12.
3. Manonmany ..	T.P. and Diarrhoea.	22/11	22/11	Plus 12/12	F. Shed 13/12 died 13/12.

Special department.

1. Meenachi ..	Cervicitis and Syphilis.	28/11	1/12	Plus 11/12	F. Shed 11/12 I.D.H. 11/12.
----------------	--------------------------	-------	------	------------	--------------------------------

Victoria ward.

1. Madavi Ammal ..	Influenza ..	30/11	2/12	Not sent.	F. Shed 4/12 died 5/12.
2. Antony Ammal ..	Enterio ..	22/9	6/12	Do.	F. Shed 5/12 died 6/12.
3. Beejan Bee ..	Pyrexia ..	2/12	7/12	Do.	Went home 8/12.
4. Annammal ..	Do. ..	4/12	8/12	Plus 8/12.	Died 10/12.

26th March 1929]

Number and name.	Disease.	Date of admission.	Date of symptoms.	Bac. result.	Disposal.
------------------	----------	--------------------	-------------------	--------------	-----------

Florence ward.

1. Krishnamoorthi ..	Tub. Enteritis.	6/12	6/12	Plus 11/12	F. Shed I.D.H. 12/12.
----------------------	-----------------	------	------	------------	-----------------------

Buckingham ward.

1. Manuswami ..	Fracture forearm.	7/12	11/12	Plus 12/12	I.D.H. 12/12.
-----------------	-------------------	------	-------	------------	---------------

Trevelyan ward.

1. Peer Mahomed ..	Duod Ulcer ..	25/11	1/12	Plus 8/12	F. Shed 9/12 died 9/12.
2. Thomas ..	Tub. Peritonitis	5/12	12/12	Plus 11/12	Admitted Maitland 12/11. Admitted Munro 4/12. Admitted Trevelyan 5/12. Transferred F. Shed 12/12. Transferred I.D.H. 12/12.

Yale ward.

1. Nagappa ..	Fracture leg ..	28/8	6/12	Plus 8/12	F. Shed 7/12 I.D.H. 9/12.
2. Rangaswami ..	Hæmorrhoid.	4/12	9/12	Not sent.	B. Shed died 10/12.
3. Vareed ..	Strict. Oesoph.	27/12	10/12	Plus	I.D.H. 10/12.
4. Sundaram ..	Duodenal Ulcer.	23/11	10/12	Plus 11/12	F. Shed I.D.H. 10/12.

Munro ward

1. Edwin Jayaseelan.	Multiple Arthritis.	23/11	5/12	Plus 1/12	F. Shed 9/12 I.D.H. 9/12.
----------------------	---------------------	-------	------	-----------	---------------------------

Denison ward.

Father Elias ..	Hæmorrhoids.	30/11	8/12	Plus 8/12.	Died 8/12; operated 5/12.
-----------------	--------------	-------	------	------------	---------------------------

Maitland ward.

Krishnan Nambiyar ..	Enteric ..	8/11	9/12	Plus 10/12.	F. Shed 10/12 died.
----------------------	------------	------	------	-------------	---------------------

Mary ward.

Jagathambal ..	Abscess groin.	13/11	10/12	Plus 11/12.	F. Shed 11/12 I.D.H. 11/12.
----------------	----------------	-------	-------	-------------	-----------------------------

(ii)

Letter from the Superintendent, General Hospital, Madras, to the Personal Assistant to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated the 23rd January 1929, R. No. 186-G/28.

[Reference.—Your letter No. 2454-3-G/28, dated 14th January 1929, regarding preventive measures to be adopted in respect of cholera.]

The following measures are in force :—

1. *Diet.*—All self-dieting is suspended pending the end of the cholera epidemic.

[26th March 1929]

All milk is boiled. This has always been done to prevent carriage of various diseases. The milk is kept covered, as protection from flies and dust. All water for drinking is boiled.

2. *Carriers*.—A look-out is kept for carriers entering the hospital. The schools of all new in-patients are cultivated. They are re-cultivated after administration of a purgative.

3. *Isolation block*.—This block has been fly-proofed. Cholera cases are only retained here until fit to move to the Infectious Diseases Hospital. They are only admitted when requiring treatment urgently; otherwise they are sent on to the Infectious Diseases Hospital at once.

4. *Staff nurses*.—The Matron Superintendent has warned all nurses to take exceptional care to prevent infection of patients in the hospital by contact with hands.

5. *Ward boys*.—This is a more difficult matter and ward boys are taught disinfection of hands to avoid causing infection and old ward boys receive a separate instruction annually in this matter.

Lascars and totis are frequently changed as they are not permanent servants and the prevention of infection by them is inculcated as far as possible. An increase of staff will be asked for to enable a permanent staff to be kept at the infectious block and avoid transfers to and from infectious and general wards.

6. *Sanitation*.—In addition to ordinary sanitary measure, special attention is given to guarding faeces kept for inspection from flies.

The Matron Superintendent is emphasizing this among the nursing staff and also the quick removal of soiled linen.

7. *Measures suggested*.—(1) It has been suggested that all latrines and places where bed-pans are kept should be fly-proofed. Fly-proofing should be extended to the Indian kitchen. The British kitchen is already fly-proofed.

(2) The isolation block in the remodelling scheme will, it is hoped, be taken in hand early. An application for this has been sent in. It is proposed to try an automatic finish in one latrine. Its advantages may be greater than its disadvantages.

Second Report.

Letter from the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, dated the 12th March 1929, R. No. 2454-Gen./28.

I have the honour to forward a second report on the cholera outbreak at the General Hospital. Thanks to the thorough investigation which has been carried out by Lieut.-Colonel King and the other members of the Committee, it is now clear that before any suspicion of cholera was aroused there were three patients in the hospital who were passing cholera vibrios in their stools without showing any signs of cholera. The infection from these to the other patients was probably by flies.

Such occurrences are, fortunately, very rare, but none the less it is very important to take every possible precaution against the spread of infection. The recommendations of the Committee have been carried out; the isolation ward has been fly-proofed and arrangements are being made to fly-proof the latrines and all places in which stools are kept.

26th March 1929]

Instructions have also been issued that there should be a prompt bacteriological examination in all cases of diarrhoea.

I am much indebted to Lieut.-Colonel King for making so thorough an investigation of the outbreak.

A second report on cholera in the Madras General Hospital in December 1928.

After the last report of the 12th December 1928, three more cases occurred among patients already in the hospital :—

(1) *Vasu*.—A case of peptic ulcers admitted on 4th December 1928 first in Yale and then in Clive wards. Cholera symptoms on 13th December 1928 found positive.

(2) *Ramaswami*.—A case of stricture of the urethra admitted on 5th December 1928 in Buckingham ward. Cholera symptoms on 13th December 1928 found positive.

(3) *Arumugam*.—Admitted with diarrhoea on 3rd December 1928 in Donovan ward. Slight diarrhoea continued was found positive on 13th December 1928.

One case was admitted on the 18th with symptoms of cholera and was positive bacteriologically. He, of course, was an absolutely outside case.

A statement from the Health Officer of Madras showing the number of cases of cholera from week ending 10th November 1928 to 9th February 1929 is attached. It shows that the hospital epidemic occurred at the end of the main epidemic in the city.

In 146 examinations made on the stools of new admissions from 18th December 1928 to 5th February 1929, none were found positive cholera. Accordingly our first conclusion must be partially revised. It is very unlikely that carrier infection played an important part in introducing cholera into the hospital. In view of this finding, of the seven cases considered in the first report to be primary cases, we must now exclude three cases (the two in Maitland and one in Florence) who probably *did not* import the infection from outside. All three were cases of diarrhoea from other causes (tuberculosis in two cases and of unknown causation in the third). Probably these three were infected while in the hospital. There is no further evidence on the method of conveyance of infection from the remaining four primary cases.

On the whole, infection from these sources conveyed by flies to the food of individual patients seems to account best for the facts. The lessons to be learnt are—

(1) The absolute necessity for a good fly-proof isolation block as far as can conveniently be managed from the main hospital—See remarks on Yale, Trevelyan and Munro in the first report.

(2) The great importance of prompt bacteriological examination of the stools of all cases of diarrhoea in time of cholera epidemics, and in the meantime the considering of all such cases as infectious. The succession of cases in Victoria ward illustrates this.

(3) The continued necessity of the routine measures already in existence for safeguarding water, milk and the food of patients.

H. H. KING, Lieut.-Col., I.M.S.

J. M. SKINNER.

M. R. GURUSWAMI,

2nd March 1929.

[26th March 1929]

Statement of attacks and deaths from cholera in Madras from week ending 10th November 1928 to 9th February 1929.

				Attacks.	Deaths.
Week ending	10th	November 1928	...	48	21
Do.	17th	Do.	...	41	31
Do.	24th	Do.	...	32	15
Do.	1st	December 1928	...	33	15
Do.	8th	Do.	...	11	6
Do.	15th	Do.	...	28	6
Do.	22nd	Do.	...	6	4
Do.	29th	Do.	...	1	1
Do.	5th	January 1929	...	6	2
Do.	12th	Do.	...	4	3
Do.	19th	Do.	...	1	...
Do.	26th	Do.	...	4	1
Do.	2nd	February 1929	...	1	4
Do.	9th	Do.	...	2	...
Total				218	109

APPENDIX III.

[Vide answer to question No. 1919 asked by Mr. A. B. Shetty at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 26th March 1929, page 865 supra.]

Copy of letter from the Secretary to the Physical Education Committee, to the Secretary to Government, Law and Education Department, dated 1st October 1928.

I have the honour to report that Government Memorandum No. 2184-B-1, Education, dated 20th September 1928, was considered at the meeting of the Committee on Physical Education held on 22nd September 1928 and I am to reply as follows.

2. The Committee are grateful to Government for the information contained in G.O. Mis. No. 2126, Revenue, dated 12th September 1928, but are unable to understand the purpose for which it was communicated.

3. The necessity for providing a new playing-field for the schools dispossessed or for the restoration of the old one is obvious, but the Committee cannot think that Government expect them to go round Madras in search of new playing-fields for this purpose.

4. The Committee are gravely discouraged by the news. They have been asked to submit to Government proposals for the provision of playing-fields and while their deliberations as to the best and surest manner of securing this end are proceeding they are confronted by the news of the resumption by Government of valuable playing-field acquired with much difficulty by a previous Committee. They feel that the same fate may await the results of their labours and that events will prove their deliberations to have been a mere waste of time and their recommendations fruitless. In the opinion of

26th March 1929]

the Committee no claim is of more importance than that of the provision and preservation of suitable open spaces for playing-fields and no consideration save that of urgent and pressing public interest should deprive schools of existing fields.

5. The Committee also notice that whereas in G.O. No. 985, Home (Education), dated 16th September 1916, the land in question was placed at the disposal of the Education Department, the present reappropriation is made by the Revenue Department and on the proposal of the Collector of Madras. Presumably the land cannot be resumed from the Education Department without its consent and they find it difficult to believe that the Education Department is prepared to sacrifice the cause of playing-fields so lightly.

6. Further in paragraph 9 of G.O. No. 1448, Education, dated 18th December 1914, it is distinctly stated that the institutions will be allowed the use of the sites 'so long as the object of alienation is kept up'. In the light of this undertaking the schools cannot in the opinion of the Committee with equity and propriety be deprived of their playing-fields.

7. The Committee would record their emphatic protest against the action of Government and would strongly urge that the playing-fields be restored to the schools.

Letter from the Secretary to Government, Law and Education Department, to the Secretary, Physical Education Committee, Madras, dated 22nd October 1928, Ref. No. 2393-B-1.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st instant, in which the Committee on Physical Education urge reconsideration of the orders of Government directing resumption of the site used as a play-ground by the pupils of the St. Bedes and San Thome High schools. In reply, I am to say that the decision to use the site for another purpose has been arrived at by Government only after every consideration had been paid to the claims and needs of the schools and that the Government regret that they are unable to reconsider it. I am to add that G.O. No. 2126, Revenue, dated 12th September 1928, was communicated to the Committee in the hope that special consideration would be paid to these schools in any allotment of playing-fields that the Committee might wish to propose.

